00066957

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 15 June, 2016

NEW AND FULL

METHOD

OF SETTLING

THE CANONICAL AUTHORITY

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

TO WHICH IS SUBJOINED

A VINDICATION OF THE FORMER PART

OF

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL,

FROM MR. WHISTON'S CHARGE OF DISLOCATIONS.

66957 ae

IN THREE VOLUMES.

BY

THE REV. JEREMIAH JONES.

VOL. I.

OXFORD:
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.
MDCCXCVIII.

00066957

A

DISSERTATION

CONCERNING

THE NECESSITY

OF SETTLING

THE CANON

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

THE deſign of the following volumes being to eſtabliſh the Canonical authority of the books of the New Teſtament, I imagined nothing could be a more ſuitable introduction to the work, than a diſſertation concerning the neceſſity of it. My deſign is not to make any ſervile apology for this work's appearance in the world (every man not only having a right, but being alſo obliged to do all he can for the intereſts of Chriſtianity); but only, if it may be, to evidence the abſolute neceſſity of a Chriſtian's employing his utmoſt diligence, in order to be upon good grounds determined in a queſtion of ſo great importance as that is, *What books are to be received as the word of God?*

What I deſign in this matter ſhall be compriſed under the following obſervations; viz.

I. That the right ſettling the Canonical authority of the books of the New Teſtament is attended with very many and great difficulties.

II. That it is a matter of the greateſt conſequence and importance.

III. That a great number of Chriſtians are deſtitute of any good arguments for their belief of the Canonical authority of the books of the New Teſtament.

IV. That very little has yet been done on this ſubject.

OBSERV. I.

That the right Settling the Canonical Authority of the Books of the New Teſtament is attended with very many and great Difficulties.

I AM very ſenſible ſuch a propoſition as this may ſeem at firſt ſurpriſing to many; and that what is ſaid under it may perhaps be, on the one hand, miſimproved by the enemies of Revelation, to ſet them more againſt it; and, on the other, by the weaker Chriſtians, to ſhock their faith in it. But as the enſuing volumes are principally intended for the ſervice of theſe two ſorts of perſons, viz. to confute the former, and eſtabliſh the latter in their principles; ſo I cannot but deſire, they would form no judgment from what is here ſaid relating to the main queſtion, till they have honeſtly peruſed the book itſelf.

This premiſed, I ſay, it is not ſo eaſy a matter as is commonly imagined, rightly to ſettle the Canon of the New Teſtament. For my own part, I declare with many learned men, that in the whole compaſs of learning I know no queſtion involved with more intricacies and perplexing difficulties than this. There are indeed conſiderable difficulties relating to the Canon of the Old Teſtament, as appears by the large controverſies

controverſies between the Proteſtants and Papiſts on this head in the laſt, and latter end of the preceding century; but theſe are ſolved with much more eaſe than thoſe of the New: For,

1. *The Canon of the Jews was ſettled by Ezra, an inſpired writer; but there is no ſuch thing to be ſaid concerning the Canon of the New.* It is uncertain, either by whom, or at what time, the preſent collection was made.

2. *The Jewiſh Canon was certainly approved by our Saviour and his Apoſtles*[a]; but it is impoſſible, in the nature of the thing, the Chriſtian Canon ſhould receive the ſame evidence and authority.

3. In ſettling the Old Teſtament collection, all that is requiſite is to diſprove the claim of a few obſcure books, which have but the weakeſt pretences to be looked upon as Scripture; but in the New, we have not only a few to diſprove, but a vaſt number to exclude the Canon, which ſeem to have much more right to admiſſion than any of the Apocryphal books of the Old Teſtament; and beſides, to evidence the genuineneſs of all thoſe which we do receive, ſince, according to the ſentiments of ſome who would be thought learned, there are none of them, whoſe authority has not been controverted in the earlieſt ages of Chriſtianity. In ſhort, whatever almoſt can be objected againſt the authority of the preſent Canon of the Old Teſtament, either in behalf of any books which are not in it, or againſt any that are, may eaſily be anſwered by this ſingle conſideration, viz. *that we receive the ſame and no other books, than what the Jewiſh Church received in our Saviour's time*, as is evident from the copies the Chriſtians procured of them, and the catalogues they made of them (eſpecially that of Melito Sardenſis[b]) ſoon after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. But the caſe is very different with reſpect to the books of the New. The queſtion concerning them di-

[a] If otherwiſe, they had certainly cenſured the Jews for their fault in this, as well as other religious matters. Beſides, St. Paul evidently allows, that all their Scriptures, were the oracles of God, Rom. iii. 2. and that what they called Scripture was every part of it inſpired.

[b] Vid. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 26. There are others very early, as Origen's in Pſal. primo, &c.

vides itſelf into theſe two, viz. 1. *Whether any other books are to be received with the ſame authority, which they are*; and, 2. *Whether they are all of them of the ſame authority, which the Church allows them by admitting them into her Canon.*

If we conſider either of theſe queſtions, we ſhall find it perhaps not ſo eaſily ſolved, as we are apt to imagine.

I. As to the firſt, viz. *Whether there are any other books to be admitted as Canonical, beſide thoſe which now are*; it will appear difficult, if we conſider,

1. *The number of books that claim admiſſion is very conſiderable.* Mr. Toland, in his celebrated catalogue [c], has preſented us with the names of above eighty, which he would have us receive with the ſame authority, as thoſe we now do. I cannot do him that honour, which Mr. Nye does in his Anſwer [d], viz. to ſay his catalogue is complete; for it will ſufficiently appear, there are many more of the ſame ſort, which he has not mentioned.

2. *Their pretences are ſpecious and plauſible*, for the moſt part going under the names of our Saviour himſelf, his Apoſtles, their companions, or immediate ſucceſſors.

3. *They are generally thought to be cited by the firſt Chriſtian writers with the ſame authority* (at leaſt many of them) *as the ſacred books we receive.* This Mr. Toland labours hard to perſuade us; but, what is more to be regarded, men of greater merit and probity have unwarily dropped expreſſions of the like nature. *Every body knows* (ſays the learned Caſaubon againſt Cardinal Baronius [e]), *that Juſtin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and the reſt of the primitive writers, were wont* [laudare libros] *to approve and cite books, which now all men know to be Apocryphal. Clemens Alexandrinus* (ſays his learned annotator Sylburgius [f]) *was too much pleaſed with Apocryphal writings.* Mr. Dodwell (in his learned diſſertations on Irenæus [g]) tells us, that *till Trajan, or perhaps Adrian's time, no Canon was fixed* —— *the ſuppoſiti-*

[c] Amyntor, p. 20, &c.
[d] Page 21.
[e] Exercit. 1. ad Apparat. Baron. Annal. N. 18. p. 54.
[f] Annot. in Clem. Oper. in ipſo fine.
[g] Diſſert. 1. §. 38, 39.

tious

tious pieces of the hereticks were received by the faithful, the Apoſtles writings bound up with theirs, and indifferently uſed in the Churches[h]. To mention now no more, the learned Mr. Spanheim obſerves, *that Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen very often cite Apocryphal books under the expreſs name of Scripture*[i]. What theſe books are, with the whole of their pretences and claims, I deſign hereafter particularly to examine; and now only to infer hence, that it is not ſo eaſy a matter, to ſettle the Canon of the New Teſtament, as is generally imagined.

4. *Hence the Canon has been judged imperfect, and it has been thought neceſſary by ſeveral learned men, that ſome other books which are in being, and the remaining fragments of thoſe which are loſt, ſhould be received.* This will but too largely appear hereafter: in the mean time, I ſhall only obſerve the ſentiments of two learned men on this matter, whoſe names are well known among us; viz. the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and Mr. Whiſton.

The former, in his Preliminary Diſcourſe to his Engliſh Tranſlation of the Apoſtolical Fathers, tells us, ch. x. §. 4. "That we cannot with any reaſon doubt of what they deliver "to us as the Goſpel of Chriſt, but ought to receive it, if "not with equal veneration, yet but with a little leſs reſpect "than we do the ſacred writings of thoſe, who were their "maſters and inſtructors. §. 11. That we are to look upon "the writings of theſe holy men, as containing the pure and "uncorrupted doctrine of our bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſ-"tles. That theſe writers were not only qualified by ordinary "means to deliver the Goſpel of Chriſt to us, but in all pro-"bability were endued with the extraordinary aſſiſtance of the "Holy Spirit too; ſo that what they teach us is not to be "looked upon, as a mere traditionary relation of what had "been delivered to them, but rather as an authoritative decla-"ration of the Goſpel of Chriſt to us. §. 23. That they were

[h] Dr. Clarke aſſerts the very ſame, as to the promiſcuous citation of ours and other books, and is quite miſtaken in ſaying, that Mr. Dodwell owns the Apocryphal books were bound in diſtinct volumes from thoſe of the Apoſtles. Reflect. on Amyntor, p. 44.

[i] Hiſtor. Chriſtian. Secul. 3. p. 706.

" inſpired men, and therefore not only have not miſtaken the " minds of the Apoſtles, but were not capable of doing it. " §. 29. That they muſt be looked upon to have nothing in " them but what was thought" (and conſequently which we are to think) " worthy of all acceptation. §. 30. That they " have received a more than human approbation——and con- " tain the true and pure faith of Chriſt, without the leaſt error " intermixed with it." It is not my buſineſs here to enquire into the truth of theſe aſſertions, nor will I venture to give my opinion in the matter, till I have produced the beſt arguments I can to ſupport it, which will be done in the third part of this work; only this I cannot but obſerve, that, notwithſtanding all this, many learned men have thought ſeveral of theſe Apoſtolical pieces not only ſpurious, but ſilly and ridiculous; and ſince theſe books (which are, and always have been excluded the Canon) are of ſo great authority with ſo great and learned a writer, that ſcarce any thing more can be ſaid of the Canonical books themſelves, it is a neceſſary and natural inference, that it is a work much harder than is generally imagined, to ſettle the Canon of the New Teſtament.

How much Mr. Whiſton has enlarged the Canon of the New Teſtament, is ſufficiently known to the learned among us. For the ſake of thoſe who have not peruſed his truly valuable books, I would obſerve, that he imagines the " Con- " ſtitutions of the Apoſtles to be inſpired, and of greater au- " thority than the occaſional writings of ſingle Apoſtles and " Evangeliſts. That the two Epiſtles of Clemens, the Doc- " trine of the Apoſtles, the Epiſtle of Barnabas, the Shepherd " of Hermas, the ſecond book of Eſdras, the Epiſtles of Igna- " tius, and the Epiſtle of Polycarp, are to be reckoned among " the ſacred authentick books of the New Teſtament; as alſo " that the Acts of Paul, the Revelation, Preaching, Goſpel " and Acts of Peter, were ſacred books, and, if they were ex- " tant, ſhould be of the ſame authority with any of the reſt *." However this learned man may be miſtaken in other matters, and though I hope to prove the Canon of the New Teſtament complete

* Eſſay on the Conſt. Introd. p. 4. and ch. i.

complete without any of theſe additions; yet, as I think it a very ſhameful neglect in learned men, not to enquire into theſe things, ſo, I am ſure, he who does, will find great difficulties in ſettling the Canon of the books of the New Teſtament.

II. The other part of the queſtion about the Canon is, *Whether all the books now admitted into the Canon of the New Teſtament are of equal authority, or the ſame authority which their being placed in the Canon ſuppoſes.* The diſcuſſing this queſtion will appear to be no leſs a difficulty than the former, if we conſider,

1. That it is impoſſible to aſſign any certain time, when a collection of theſe books, either by the Apoſtles, or any council of inſpired or learned men near their times, was made.

2. That they have been all, or moſt of them, rejected by ſome hereticks, or others, in the firſt ages.

3. That ſeveral of them have not been received by thoſe, who did not go under the name of hereticks before Euſebius's time.

4. That ſeveral of them have had their authority diſputed by learned men in later times.

Though I hope fully to confute theſe ſpecious objections, and all others that can be made againſt our preſent collection, in the fourth part of this book; yet every one muſt allow ſuch objections to make the buſineſs of ſettling the Canon not ſo eaſy, as is commonly imagined.

1. As to the firſt of theſe, *viz. That we cannot aſſign any certain time, when a collection of theſe books was made, or a Canon ſettled by the Apoſtles, or any inſpired perſons near their time*, the matter is too certain to need much to be ſaid of it. Mr. Dodwell [l], Dr. Grabe [m], and Dr. Mills [n], our beſt writers on theſe heads, have obſerved it already; though I

[l] Atqui certe ante illam epocham, quam dixi, Trajani, nondum conſtitutus eſt librorum ſacrorum Canon, nec receptus aliquis in Eccleſia Catholica librorum certus numerus——nec rejecti Hæreticorum Pſeudepigraphi, &c. Diſſert. in Iren. §. 39.

[m] Canon ſacrorum librorum non ſtatim conſtitutus eſt ab initio Eccleſiæ, &c. Spicileg. Patr. Tom. 1. p. 320.

[n] Vid. ejus Prolegom. in Novo Teſtam. p. 23.

hope to prove their arguings on this head (I mean of the two former) to be falſe and groundleſs.

2. *That many, or moſt of the books of the New Teſtament, have been rejected by hereticks in the firſt ages, is alſo certain.*

Fauſtus Manichæus and his followers are ſaid to have rejected all the New Teſtament, as not written by the Apoſtles [o].

Marcion rejected all, except St. Luke's Goſpel [p].

The Manichees diſputed much againſt the authority of St. Matthew's Goſpel [q].

The Alogians rejected the Goſpel of St. John, as not his, but made by Cerinthus [r].

The Acts of the Apoſtles were rejected by Severus, and the ſect of his name [s].

The ſame rejected all Paul's Epiſtles [t], as did alſo the Ebionites [u], and the Helkeſaites [x].

Others, who did not reject all, rejected ſome particular Epiſtles, of which inſtances will be given hereafter.

3 *Several of the books of the New Teſtament were not univerſally received, even among them who were not hereticks, in the firſt ages.* Euſebius tells us [y], the authority of the ſecond Epiſtle of Peter, and the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, was diſputed; and in another place [z], that the Epiſtles of James, Jude, the ſecond Epiſtle of Peter, the ſecond and third Epiſtles of John, were not univerſally received, but doubted of by ſome: the ſame, or rather more, he ſays of the Revelation of St. John.

4. *Several of them have had their authority diſputed by learned men in later times.* Luther and ſeveral of his followers utterly reject the Epiſtle of James, not only as a ſpurious piece,

[o] Auguſt. cont. Fauſt. Manich. l. 32. c. 2. et 8. This is urged by Toland in Amynt. p. 61, &c. but diſputed by Mr. Nye in his Anſwer, p. 30, &c.

[p] Epiphan. Hæreſ. 42. de Marcionit.

[q] Vid. Auguſt. cont. Fauſt. l. 2. 3, et 7.

[r] Auguſt. lib. de Hæreſ. 30. et Epiphan. Hæreſ. 51. de Alog.

[s] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 29.

[t] Ibid.

[u] Id. lib. 3. c. 27. Vid. et Epiphan. Hæreſ. 30. de Ebion.

[x] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 38.

[y] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.

[z] Id. lib. 3. c. 25.

but

but as containing things directly contrary to the Goſpel [a]. Eraſmus had a very mean opinion, and doubted the Canonical authority, of the Revelations [b]. Calvin, Cajetan, and the learned Kirſtenius [c], had the ſame ſentiments of it. But referring this and many other things, which might be ſaid under this and the foregoing heads, to their proper place, I ſhall only infer from the whole, that if ſo many books, beſide what we now receive, claim admiſſion into our Canon, in the judgment of learned men; if we can prove no certain time, when the Canon was fixed in the firſt, or beginning of the ſecond century; if there were ſuch controverſies, not only among the orthodox and heretics, but among the orthodox themſelves, concerning the authority of ſeveral books; and laſtly, if ſeveral books have been rejected by learned men of late; it follows moſt undeniably, that it requires our utmoſt diligence and induſtry, as being apparently a work of the greateſt difficulty, to ſettle the Canon of the New Teſtament.

OBSERV. II.

That ſettling the Canonical Authority of the Books of the New Teſtament, is a Matter of the greateſt Conſequence and Importance.

FOR if, on the one hand, any book be received as the word of God, which is not ſo; or, on the other hand, any book be not received as the word of God, which really is ſo, the conſequences are fatal and dangerous, and the neglect of due enquiry in ſuch a matter muſt needs be very criminal.

I. As to the firſt, viz. *Receiving books for inſpired, which are not ſo*, the conſequences are evidently very bad; as,

1. *We thereby offer a notorious affront to our Maker*, not only making him the author of lies and forgeries, but imputing the falſe, perhaps blaſphemous conceptions of ill-deſigning

[a] See Manton. Pref. to James.
[b] Vid. Annot. in Rev. 22.
[c] See the Preface to Dr. Gregory's Works, p. 10.

men,

men, ſuggeſted by the father of lies, to the inſpiration of his Holy Spirit. Thus injurious to the honour of God are many of the Apocryphal books both of the Old and New Teſtament, in which we find, not only the moſt ſilly and frivolous ſtories, not like the dictates of the Holy Ghoſt, but direct contrarieties to the moſt certain truths. Thus the author of the book of Tobit makes his angel *guilty of a groſs lie*, ſaying firſt, that he was Azarias the ſon of Ananias, ch. v. ver. 12. and afterwards, ch. xii. ver. 15. that he was Raphael, one of the ſeven angels.

The author of the Wiſdom of Solomon very plainly aſſerts the *doctrine of the pre-exiſtence of ſouls*, before they are brought into bodies, ch. viii. ver. 19, 20.

The author of Baruch ſays, ch. i. ver. 1, 2, 3. that *he read his book to the captives the fifth year of the captivity in Babylon*, when it is certain the true Baruch was with Jeremiah in Egypt, Jer. xliii. ver. 5, 6, 7.

To omit a hundred ſuch inſtances, I ſhall only produce a few ſuch from the Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament, by which it will appear, how bad the conſequence would be of receiving thoſe books for genuine, which are not. Thus for inſtance it would be, ſhould any receive *thoſe ſpurious books, attributed to our Saviour* [d], which, the wicked authors of them pretended, did contain thoſe magical arts, by which he wrought his miracles.

Thus it would be, ſhould the celebrated *Goſpel of the Nazarenes* (which Father Simon and others reckon the true one of St. Matthew) be received as inſpired; which makes our Lord Jeſus Chriſt unwilling to be baptized by John, nay intimates, he was not baptized at all; that he queſtioned, whether he was not a ſinner, &c [e]. that the Holy Ghoſt took him by one of his hairs into the great mount Thabor, &c [f].

[d] Vid. Auguſt. de Conſenſ. Evangel. l. 1. c. 3. to. Tom. Opp. iv.

[e] Ecce mater Domini et fratres eius dicebant ei, Joannes Baptiſta baptizat in remiſſionem peccatorum; eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis, Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo, niſi forte hoc ipſum quod dixi ignorantia eſt? Hieronym. adv. Pelag. l. 3. c. 1.

[f] Ἄρτι ἐλάβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου, καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ.

In the book, intitled *The Preaching of Paul*, we have almoſt the ſame ſtory of Chriſt's unwillingneſs to be baptized, till forced to it by his mother; his confeſſing his ſins, &c [g].

It were eaſy to produce many ſuch inſtances; theſe may ſhew us, of how dangerous conſequence it is, to receive any books for the word of God, which are not ſo, ſeeing we impute ſuch wretched fooleries, nonſenſe, and contradictions to the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt.

2. By receiving books as the word of God, which are not ſo, *we aſſent to the moſt groſs and notorious errors as indubitable truths, and ſo very often ſhall be like to oblige ourſelves to many burdenſome imaginary duties, not only not required in the word of God, but perhaps directly contrary to the true mind and will of God revealed in it.*

St. Luke was ſo ſenſible of this dangerous conſequence from the many ſpurious Apocryphal Goſpels extant in his time, that he wrote his Goſpel with this kind intention to prevent it, as he himſelf informs us in his preface [h]. St. Paul likewiſe, apprehenſive of ſuch pernicious evils, that might be produced by any ſpurious Epiſtles pretending under his name to inſpiration, warns the Theſſalonians not to receive them, nor be influenced in their judgment by them [i]. And indeed there is apparently the greateſt reaſon for care and caution in this matter; for inſtance,

What wretched principles in Chriſtianity muſt they have, who received the forementioned books, *of Chriſt's working his Miracles by magical arts*, or *believed him to be a ſinner!* What an odd religion muſt they profeſs and practiſe, who ſhould receive that other book, attributed to our Saviour [k], in which he declares, *he was no way againſt the heathen Gods*, &c.

Θαβὼρ, &c. Origen. tom. 2. in Joan. p. 58. et Hieronym. l. 2. Comment. in Mich. vii. 6.

[g] In hoc libro contra omnes Scripturas, et Chriſtum de proprio peccato confitentem invenies—et ad accipiendum Joannis Baptiſma pæne invitum a matre ſua Maria eſſe compulſum, &c. Vid. Tract. de non iterando Baptiſm. ad calcem Opp. Cyp.

[h] Luke, i. 5. That this is the meaning of St. Luke's preface, I have proved in my Vindication of St. Matthew's Goſpel againſt Mr. Whiſton, and ſhall more fully ſhew hereafter.

[i] 2 Theſſ. ii. 2.

[k] Vid. Auguſt. de Conſenſ. Evang. l. 1. c. 34.

They

They who received the book, called *The Acts or Journeys of the Apoſtles, Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul*, muſt believe, *that Chriſt was not really, but only appeared as a man; and was ſeen by his Diſciples in various forms, ſometimes as a young man, ſometimes as an old one, ſometimes as a child, ſometimes great, ſometimes ſmall, ſometimes ſo tall, that his head would reach the clouds; that he was not really crucified himſelf, but another in his ſtead, while he laughed at thoſe who imagined they crucified him*, &c. [1]

A little acquaintance with Chriſtian antiquities will furniſh us with various inſtances of this ſort. Pretences to inſpiration were very frequent in the firſt ages, and it was the conſtant artifice of evil-minded deſigning men, to publiſh their errors under the great name of ſome Apoſtle, or inſpired writer, in order the more effectually to propagate them among the unthinking multitude. Irenæus tells us [m], the Gnoſtics for this purpoſe *made a prodigious number of Apocryphal and ſpurious Scriptures in his time*; and it is well known, that Baſilides, Apelles, Cerinthus, Marcion, Tatian, and many other of the firſt heretics, purſued the ſame method with too great ſucceſs. Thus, to give now no other inſtance, the Nicolaitans, mentioned Rev. ii. 6. *forged a book under the name of the inſpired Apoſtle Matthias* [n], *to juſtify themſelves in the execrable vice of the communion of women* [o]. Thus does the receiving ſpurious books, under ſpecious pretences, lay us under a neceſſity of errors in doctrine and practice; and it is not without concern, that I put the reader in mind of a living inſtance of this in the

[1] See this whole matter related by the learned Photius, who read the book Biblioth. Cod. cxiv. I am apt to think it was in the Goſpel of Baſilides alſo, ſince ſuch a Goſpel there certainly was; and Irenæus adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 23. and Epiphanius Hæreſ. 24. tell us, Baſilides and his followers ſaid, it was not Chriſt that was crucified, but Simon of Cyrene.

N. B. If theſe were the Acts of Peter, Mr. Whiſton would have reckoned them among the ſacred books; he muſt ſtrike out ſeveral of theſe to make room for it.

[m] Ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν ἐπλασαν. Adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 17.

[n] Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 3. p. 436.

[o] It is ſuppoſed by learned men, that the Traditions of Matthias cited by the Nicolaitans, was a book, though perhaps properly called *Traditions*, being never written.

learned

learned Mr. Whiſton, whom one cannot without compaſſion behold honeſtly paying the greateſt regard to the pretended Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles, and *not daring* (as he ſays) *any more to diſbelieve the doctrines, or diſobey the duties therein delivered and enjoined, than he dare do the like, as to the known doctrines and duties plainly contained in the unconteſted books of the New Teſtament* [p].

II. It muſt needs alſo be of very bad conſequence, that any book be excluded from the Canon, which really is the word of God; for hereby,

1. We caſt contempt upon God and his Spirit, in refuſing *to hear* what the Lord our God hath ſpoken to us.

2. We are injurious to ourſelves, as we deny ourſelves the uſe of the means of ſalvation.

Thus the Ebionites, Manichees, and moſt of the primitive hereticks, by diſowning ſeveral parts of the New Teſtament, fell into thoſe errors, which proved ſo fatal to their moſt important intereſts.

OBSERV. III.

Notwithſtanding the importance of this ſubject, a very conſiderable number of thoſe, who are called Chriſtians, are deſtitute of any juſt arguments for their belief of the Canonical Authority of the preſent Books of the New Teſtament.

THOUGH I would by no means be the occaſion of ſhocking any perſon's faith in a buſineſs of this nature, yet I think the preſent obſervation to be ſo much to my preſent purpoſe, and withal ſo very true, that I cannot paſs it over, though it be on a ſubject ſo diſagreeable. He, who has but the leaſt occaſion to acquaint himſelf with the religious ſtate of mankind, cannot but with ſurpriſing concern have obſerved, how ſlender and uncertain the principles are, upon which men receive the Scriptures as the word of God. The truth is (though a

[p] Eſſay on Conſtitut. Introd. p. 11.

very

very melancholy one), that many perſons commence religious at firſt they don't know why, and ſo with a blind zeal perſiſt in a religion, which is they don't know what; by the chance of education, and the force of cuſtom, they receive theſe Scriptures as the word of God, without making any ſerious enquiries, and conſequently without being able to give any ſolid reaſons, why they believe them to be ſuch. This has been obſerved and lamented by our beſt divines long ſince, and by none more than the pious Mr. Baxter, in whoſe words I ſhall rather chooſe to expreſs myſelf, on this tender ſubject, than my own: "Few Chriſtians among us, for aught I find, (ſays he[q]) "have any better than the Popiſh implicit faith in this point, "nor any better arguments than the Papiſts have, to prove "the Scriptures the word of God. They have received it "by tradition: godly miniſters and Chriſtians tell them ſo: it "is impious to doubt of it: therefore they believe it. Though "we could perſuade people never ſo confidently, that Scrip-"ture is the very word of God, and yet teach them no more "reaſon, why they ſhould believe this, than any other book, "to be that word; as it will prove in them no right way of "believing, ſo it is in us no right way of teaching. It is "ſtrange (ſays he[r]) to conſider, how we all abhor that piece "of Popery, as moſt injurious to God of all the reſt, which "reſolves our faith into the authority of the Church; and yet "that we do, for the generality of profeſſors, content ourſelves "with the ſame kind of faith; only with this difference, the "Papiſts believe Scripture to be the word of God, becauſe "their Church ſaith ſo; and we, becauſe our Church, or our "leaders ſay ſo. Yea, and many miniſters never yet gave "their people better grounds, but tell them, that it is dam-"nable to deny it, but help them not to the neceſſary ante-"cedents of faith. [s] It is to be underſtood, that many a thou-"ſand do profeſs Chriſtianity, and zealouſly hate the enemies "thereof, upon the ſame grounds, to the ſame end, and from "the ſame inward corrupt principles, as the Jews did hate "and kill Chriſt. It is the religion of the country, where

[q] Saint's Reſt, part 2. §. 1. p. 197.

[r] Ibid. §. 2. p. 201.

[s] Ibid. §. 2. p. 202.

"every

"every man is reproached, that believes otherwiſe; they were "born and brought up in this belief, and it hath increaſed "in them upon the like occaſions. Had they been born "and bred in the religion of Mahomet, they would have "been as zealous for him. The difference betwixt him and "a Mahometan, is more that he lives where better laws and "religion dwell, than that he hath more knowledge or ſound-"neſs of apprehenſion." Thus far he; nor is the caſe, I fear, much altered for the better ſince his time. What ſorry reaſons, when aſked, are the generality of perſons able to give for the divine authority of Scripture! Nay, to uſe Mr. Baxter's words once more, "Are the more exerciſed underſtanding "ſort of Chriſtians able, by ſound arguments, to make good "the verity of Scripture? Nay, are the meaner ſort of miniſ-"ters in England able to do this? Let them that have tried, "judge[t]." If the queſtion be, why Barnabas's Epiſtle be rejected, and Jude's received; why the Goſpel of Peter was excluded, and the Epiſtle of Peter admitted into the Canon as the word of God, &c. alas! how little ſhall we have given in anſwer, unleſs what Mr. Baxter ſays, *we believe as the Church does!* As for thoſe happy perſons, who are able, by the internal teſtimony of the Holy Spirit, to diſtinguiſh between Canonical and Apocryphal books, I ſhall ſay nothing now; only obſerve, their number is very ſmall, deſigning hereafter to do all poſſible juſtice to this argument, ſo much inſiſted on by our firſt Reformers. What I have now to do is to obſerve, from the melancholy experience we have of perſons ignorance of the grounds of Scripture-belief, how neceſſary it is we ſhould uſe our utmoſt endeavours to remove it. Not that I think it neceſſary, or indeed poſſible, for every one to ſearch the antient records of Chriſtianity; but that thoſe, who are able, ſhould do it, and endeavour to convey as much knowledge, as may be, of theſe matters into the minds of thoſe who cannot. And certainly this muſt be of the utmoſt neceſſity; for,

[t] Ibid. §. 1. p. 197.

1. *Our*

1. *Our aſſent to any propoſition can only be in proportion to its evidence.* The truth is, ſays the learned Mr. Hooker[u], "That how bold and confident ſoever we may be in words, "when it cometh to the point of trial, ſuch as the evidence is, "which the truth hath, either in itſelf, or through proof, "ſuch is the heart's aſſent thereunto; neither can it be "ſtronger, being grounded as it ſhould be." This evidently appears from the nature of things; and therefore, as perſons evidences for the truth of Scripture are, ſuch will be their aſſent.

2. *In proportion to the degree of our aſſent to any truth, will be its influence upon us.* This, however it may ſeem at firſt, will, upon cloſe enquiry, be found no leſs true than the former. There ſeems to be no other way poſſible of accounting for men's diſregard of the important duties of religion, but by ſuppoſing their tacit diſbelief of its principles. "For my "own part (ſays Mr. Baxter[x]) I take it to be the greateſt "cauſe of coldneſs in duty, weakneſs in graces, boldneſs in "ſinning, and unwillingneſs to die, &c. that our faith is ei-"ther unſound or infirm in this point. This worm lying at "the root, cauſeth the languiſhing and decay of the whole." St. Paul, by this very means, accounts for the ſtrange diſobedience of the Iſraelites, viz. they did not really believe the promiſes. (See Heb. iv. 2.) And it is a ſort of proverbial and very juſt obſervation, that *unbelief is the ſource of, or is in, all our ſins.* It were eaſy to ſay a great deal to ſupport the aſſertion, of the proportion that is in our practice to our faith, not only in principles of religion, but all other things; I ſhall only now make this reflection, that if it be ſo, we are proportionably concerned, as we would have our practice agreeable to the will of God, to uſe our beſt endeavours to get the ſtrongeſt evidence for the authority of the ſacred books.

[u] Eccleſiaſt. Polit. book 2. p. 117.

[x] Ubi ſupr. p. 197. See p. 199, 200.

OBSERV.

OBSERV. IV.

That though it be a Matter of ſo great Difficulty and Importance, to determine the Canonical Authority of the Books of the New Teſtament, and though the generality of Chriſtians are ſo very ignorant in this Matter; yet very little has been done by learned Men on this Subject.

IT is indeed ſtrange, that in ſo great a variety of books of all ſorts, ſo few or none ſhould have been publiſhed on this ſubject. It muſt be remembered, that I am now ſpeaking only of the New Teſtament; for about the Canon of the Old, Chamier, Whitaker, Dr. John Reynolds, Dr. Coſin, Spanheim, Biſhop Burnet, and many others, have written much, and to good purpoſe. Mr. Du Pin is the only one I know, who has wrote purpoſely on the Canon of the New; beſide what has been wrote occaſionally in the Prefaces and Prolegomena of commentators on particular books, and the Reflections of Mr. Nye, Mr. Richardſon, and Dr. Clarke on Toland's Amyntor. The firſt of theſe is reckoned the moſt conſiderable; though, in my judgment, the other leſſer pieces have done much more to eſtabliſh the Canon than this larger work of Mr. Du Pin: For,

1. The greateſt part of the work is upon ſubjects very different from the Canon; ſuch as, the purity of the Greek text, the antient manuſcripts, various readings, Latin and Oriental verſions, the diviſion of the New Teſtament into titles, chapters, &c.

2. There is in it but very little ſaid to eſtabliſh the Canonical authority of the books, and anſwer what is objected againſt the controverted pieces; viz. the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, of James, Jude, the ſecond Epiſtle of Peter, the ſecond and third of John, and the Revelations. In that place where he propoſes to eſtabliſh them, he does not ſpend much above one page in doing it; and though, for the proof of the authority of theſe books, he names ſuch and ſuch Fathers who cited them, yet he neither informs the unlearned reader at what time theſe Fathers lived, nor the learned, in what part of their works

they do cite them: ſo that the former muſt neceſſarily be ignorant of the force of his argument, as the latter will be of the truth of it.

3. His ſixth chapter, which is all he has wrote of the Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament, is wretchedly defective, both in the enumerating and confuting them; beſides that he has given us ſcarce any of their fragments, and indeed has ſaid ſcarce any thing of them.

A METHOD

A

METHOD

FOR

SETTLING THE CANON

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

PART I.

CHAP. I.

What the Word Canon *ſignifies: How and when it came to be applied to the Books of Scripture.*

THE infinitely good God, having favoured mankind with a revelation of his will, has thereby obliged all thoſe, who are bleſſed with the knowledge thereof, to regard it as the unerring rule of their faith and practice. Under this character, the Prophets, Apoſtles, and other writers of the ſacred books, publiſhed and delivered them to the world; and on this account they were dignified above all others with the titles of the *Canon* and *Canonical*. The word *Canon* is originally Greek, and did in that language (as well as in the Latin afrerwards) commonly denote *that which was a rule or ſtandard, by which other things were to be examined and*

judged[a]. And inaſmuch as the books of divine inſpiration contained the moſt remarkable rules, and the moſt important directions of all others, the collection of them, in time, obtained the name of the *Canon*, and each book was called *Canonical*. At what time they were firſt thus called, is not very eaſy to determine. Some imagine St. Paul himſelf to have given this title to the ſacred books extant in his time, Gal. vi. 16. and Phil. iii. 16[b]. But the Apoſtle ſeems in thoſe places rather to ſpeak of the doctrine of the Goſpel, than any books which contained it; although it is very probable that St. Paul's uſing the word *Canon* in theſe places, was the occaſion of its afterwards being affixed to the books themſelves.

This ſeems the moſt genuine account of the original of this appellation; nor do I know of any other that has been, or can be aſſigned, beſide that of Mr. Du Pin and Mr. Whiſton.

The former[c] ſuppoſes the word *Canon* to denote the ſame as *Catalogue*, and the inſpired books to be called *Canonical*, only *becauſe the catalogue of them was ſtyled the Canon*. But, in anſwer to this, it will be ſufficient to obſerve, that the Greek word is never uſed in that ſenſe, which he ſuppoſes, in any prophane writers, nor even among the Chriſtians till the fourth century; before which time the word was certainly applied to the ſacred volume.

Mr. Whiſton[d] imagines the Canon of Scripture, or the Canonical books of the Old and New Teſtament, are thoſe, and only thoſe, which are inſerted into the laſt *Apoſtolical Canon*, and were ſo ſtyled by the antients only on that account.

[a] The word Κανὼν ſeems originally to have ſignified the *Tongue of a Balance*, or that ſmall part of the ſcales, which, by its perpendicular ſituation, determines the even poize or weight; or, by its inclination either way, the uneven poize of the things which are weighed. So the ancient Greek ſcholiaſt of Ariſtophanes has obſerved on *κανόνας*.] *ευρίως τὸ ἐπάνω τῆς τερυτάνης ὂν, καὶ εἰς ἰσότητα ταύτην ἄγον.* In Ran. v. 811.

Ἀνθρώπων βάλησις ἐπ' ἀσφαλὴς κανών. Ariſtot. Politic. l. 2. c. 10.

[b] Στοιχεῖν κανόνι τέτῳ. Vid. Michael. Walther. Offic. Bibl. §. 564.

[c] Hiſtory of the Canon of the Old Teſt. b. 1. c. 1. §. 2.

[d] Eſſay on the Apoſtol. Conſtit. c. 1. §. 6.

But

But the ſpuriouſneſs of theſe pretended Apoſtolical Canons being a matter ſo univerſally agreed on, and in itſelf ſo very certain, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter, I need now ſay no more to diſprove this opinion; only will obſerve theſe two or three things: viz.

1. That if the antients ſtyled the ſacred books Canonical, becauſe they are recited in the eighty-fifth Canon of the Apoſtles, then it will moſt undeniably follow, that *all and every one of the books recited therein muſt equally have been reputed or called Canonical.* But the contrary to this is ſufficiently known; nor can any one ſingle inſtance be produced out of any of the firſt writers of Chriſtianity, in which either the Book of Judith, the three Books of the Maccabees, the Wiſdom of Syrach, among the books of the Old Teſtament; or the two Epiſtles of Clemens, or the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions of Clemens, among thoſe of the New, were reputed Canonical; yet are each of theſe inſerted in the forementioned Canon, which goes under the Apoſtles' names: an argument ſufficient of itſelf to prove the ſpuriouſneſs of theſe Canons; the books therein recommended being not only evidently fictitious, but in many things contrary to the known doctrine of the Apoſtles.

2. On the other hand, if the books were called Canonical on account of their inſertion in this Canon of the Apoſtles, then it ſeems utterly inconceivable, *how any book or books could be ever reckoned Canonical, which are not found in it.* How, for inſtance, could the book of Revelations be reckoned Canonical, which is not inſerted in this Canon? And yet we find it expreſsly mentioned under this title by the antients very early: for Origen, reckoning up the ſacred books (τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, *reciting the Canonical books*, as Euſebius phraſes it[e]) among theſe mentions the Revelation written by John. Now if only the books mentioned in this Apoſtolical Canon were called Canonical, how came this book, not mentioned there, to be called ſo? How came this by the name, as well as the reſt mentioned there? To ſay a book is Ca-

[e] Orig. Comment. in Matt. Procem. et Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.

nonical, becauſe recited in ſuch a Canon, and yet the book not there, is much the ſame as to ſay, the book is, and is not in the Canon.

Notwithſtanding what has been ſaid, there is no doubt but this denomination of the ſacred books is of the greateſt antiquity. Irenæus, ſpeaking of the Scriptures, ſtyles them, τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας, i. e. *the Canon of Truth* [f]. Clemens Alexandrinus, diſputing with ſome heretics of his time, blames them for making uſe of Apocryphal Scriptures, *chooſing rather to follow any, than the true Canonical Goſpels* [g]. Euſebius [h] in ſo many words tells us, that Origen, in his Expoſition on Matthew, *enumerates the books of Scripture according to the Canon of the Church*; i. e. the Canon received and eſtabliſhed in the Church. Athanaſius [i] (if that book be his, de Synopſ. Scriptur.) expreſsly mentions the books of Scripture, *as contained in a certain Canon*. And Epiphanius [k], ſpeaking of the heretics called Apotacticks, ſays, *they received the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew and Thomas, rejecting the Canon received by the Church*. Philaſtrius uſes the diſtinction of *Canonical* and *Apocryphal*, as well known in his time [l]. I ſhall only add, that in the writings of Ruffin [m], Jerome [n], and eſpecially Auſtin [o], we meet with theſe words in innumerable places.

[f] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 4. c. 69. in fine.
[g] Stromat. l. 3. p. 453.
[h] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.
[i] Synopſ. tot. Script. in initio.
[k] Hæreſ. 61. §. 1.
[l] Ib. 87.
[m] Expoſit. in Symbol. Apoſtol. juxta finem.
[n] Prolog. in Matth. Comment. in Epheſ. c. v. ver. 31.
[o] Epiſt. ad Hieronym. 19. Epiſt. ad Paulin. 112. Lib. contra Fauſt. Manich. l. 11. c. 5. De Civit. Dei, l. 11. c. 3. l. 15. c. 23. l. 18. c. 38. et l. 19. c. 18.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

An Enquiry into the Intimations there are in the received Writings of the New Teſtament, of Spurious and Apocryphal Pieces extant in the Apoſtles' Time.

PROP. I.

Beſide thoſe books, which are now commonly received into the Canon of the New Teſtament, there have been many others, under the names either of our Saviour, his Apoſtles, or their contemporaries, which may ſeem to claim the ſame authority.

IN order to eſtabliſh the Canon of the New Teſtament, it is of abſolute neceſſity, that the pretences of all other books to Canonical authority be firſt carefully examined and refuted. The large number of theſe books, the plauſible arguments ſome of them are ſupported with, and the too favourable and unguarded expreſſions of many learned men relating to them (as has been hinted in the preceding diſſertation, Obſerv. I.), make it impoſſible rightly to ſettle the Canon, without a particular conſideration of them. My firſt buſineſs therefore will be, to give the Reader as large and particular an account of theſe as can; in order to which I obſerve, in the firſt place,

That *there are ſome intimations of ſuch books in the now received Scriptures of the New Teſtament*; ſo very early was this artifice of Satan againſt the true intereſt of Chriſtianity. The moſt remarkable places of the New Teſtament are the following; viz.

1. That of St. Luke in the preface to his Goſpel, c. i. v. 1, 2, 3. *Foraſmuch as many have taken in hand to ſet forth in order a declaration of thoſe things, which are moſt ſurely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witneſſes and miniſters of the Word, it ſeemed good to me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of all things*

from the very firſt, to write unto thee in order, moſt excellent Theophilus. A little conſideration on theſe words will oblige us to conclude, that there were in St. Luke's time many falſe and ſpurious goſpels, or hiſtories of our Saviour's life and doctrine. For the deſign of them is evidently this, to give Theophilus an account of the reaſon or motives, which induced him to write his Goſpel, viz. becauſe many others had engaged in the ſame work before. But this could not poſſibly have been any reaſon for his writing, unleſs thoſe others had been defective or falſe in their accounts. If otherwiſe, viz. if thoſe other Goſpels had been genuine and true, the number of them ſhould rather have prevented than forwarded him in his work. Thus the antients [p], as well as moſt modern writers, underſtand Saint Luke in this place [q]: But having treated of this matter more largely in another place [r], I muſt refer the Reader there. Nor ſhall I here enquire, what thoſe Goſpels were, which St. Luke refers to; though ſeveral of the antients [s], and Dr. Grabe [t] of late, have imagined, he eſpecially reſpected the Goſpel of the Egyptians and the Nazarenes, as extant at that time.

2. Another inſtance of a ſpurious writing under an Apoſtle's name ſeems to me fairly to be gathered from thoſe words of St. Paul, 2 Theſſ. ii. 2. *Be not ſoon ſhaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by ſpirit, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Chriſt is at hand.* The plain purport of which words is, to guard them againſt a groundleſs expectation they were in danger of being wrought up to, of Chriſt's ſecond coming, by the deluſive artifices of falſe Apoſtles. He cautions them not to be deceived by any of their falſe methods, and particularly not by any Epiſtle they ſhould produce under his name. Nothing

[p] Origen. Homil. in Luc. i. 1. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24. Ambroſ. Comment. in Luc. i. Auguſt. de Conſenſ. Evang. l. 4. c. 8.

[q] Eraſmus in Luc. i. 1. Bellarm. de Matrim. Sacr. l. 1. c. 16. Grot. in Luc. i. 1. Huet. Demonſt. Evang. Prop. 1. §. 16. Father Simon Critic. Hiſt. of the New Teſtam. Par. 1. c. 3.

[r] Vindication of St. Matthew's Goſpel againſt Mr. Whiſton, c. 2. p. 9, &c.

[s] Origen. Homil. in Luc. i. 1. Hieron. Pref. in Matth. Theophylact. in Luc. i. 1.

[t] Spicileg. Patr. ſecul. 1. p. 31, &c.

can

can be more evidently implied in the words μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν, than that the Apoſtle ſuſpected ſome ſpurious Epiſtle to be publiſhed under his name in Theſſalonica. Some of our beſt expoſitors [u], not obſerving the force of the particle ὡς here, have imagined Saint Paul in theſe words to refer to his former Epiſtle: but nothing can be more improbable; for, 1. It renders the ſignificant particle ὡς quite uſeleſs and ſuperfluous: 2. It makes the Apoſtle rank his own Epiſtle in the ſame claſs with ſpurious revelations and falſe diſcourſes, which he warns them not to be influenced by. Hence the antient writers of Chriſtianity, Tertullian, Origen, and others, who knew what great numbers of books were forged early under the Apoſtles' names, expound this paſſage of ſome ſuppoſititious pieces falſely aſcribed to St. Paul [w]; and ſo alſo ſeveral of our modern writers [x]. I would only add, that this expoſition is moſt clearly confirmed by the concluſion of the Epiſtle, which runs thus [y], *The ſalutation of me Paul with my own hand, which is the token in every Epiſtle, ſo I write.* In which words, by reaſon of the ſuppoſititious Epiſtle under his name, he gives them a certain mark, by which they ſhould be always able to diſtinguiſh his genuine writings, from any that pretended to be his. It is plain, therefore, that even while St. Paul was alive, there were counterfeited Epiſtles publiſhed under his name.

3. I offer it as a conjecture, that St Paul hath reſpect to the *Apocryphal Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, in thoſe words, Gal. i. 6. *I marvel, that ye are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel.* For though it is always ſuppoſed, the word *Goſpel* here means the doctrine of the Goſpel; yet perhaps, as I ſaid, it is that ſuppoſititious Goſpel, which the Chriſtianized Jews were ſo fond of, that is here meant. The reaſons of my conjecture I ſhall lay down in the following obſervations; for the ſupport of which, I think it needleſs

[u] Beza, Hammond, and Whitby in loc.

[w] Tertullian. de Reſurrect. Carn. c. 24. Origen. Epiſt. ad Charos ſuos apud Ruffin. de depray. Origen.

[x] Grotius et Calvin. in loc. Cocus Cenſ. vet. Script. Præfat. Eſtius in 2 Theſ. iii. 17. Fabrit. Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſt. Tom. 2. p. 916.

[y] 2 Theſſ. iii. 17.

to

to offer any arguments, the things being, I ſuppoſe, well known to all, who are at all verſed in Chriſtian antiquities.

1. *A great number of the converts to Chriſtianity, at firſt, were ſuch as profeſſed the Jewiſh Religion.* We are told, Acts xxi. 20. of many (μυριάδες) ten thouſands of Jews, that believed and received the doctrines of Chriſt. Nor are we to ſuppoſe this true only of the inhabitants of Jeruſalem, and the land of Paleſtine, but of thoſe alſo who lived in Gentile countries, and very probably many of them, ſuch who had been converted before from Paganiſm to Judaiſm [z].

2. *Theſe were generally ſuch, who were for mixing Judaiſm with Chriſtianity, and taught as neceſſary, not only a belief of Jeſus as the Meſſiah, but an obſervance of the laws of Moſes.* This is very evident from the whole ſcope of ſeveral of St. Paul's Epiſtles. And Epiphanius tells us, the Nazarenes (by which name theſe half-chriſtians were called) *differed little or nothing from the Jews in any thing, only that they believed in Chriſt.*

3. *The better to ſupport and propagate their principles, they had a Goſpel ſuited to their own judgements, and called by their own names.* This they were ſo exceeding fond of, as to reject all others [a].

4. *The converts to Chriſtianity among the Galatians were certainly much prevailed upon by theſe Nazarenes, to intermix Judaiſm with Chriſtianity.* And for this very reaſon St. Paul wrote this Epiſtle to them, in order to prevent their being any farther deluded by them. This is plain by the whole deſign of the Letter; and therefore,

5. When in this Epiſtle he makes mention of any falſe Goſpel, by which they had been ſeduced to the principles of the Nazarenes, *it muſt be very unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, he did not mean the Goſpel of the Nazarenes.*

z Il ſemble qu'une grande partie de ceux qui embraſsèrent les premiers l'Evangile dans ces lieux-là, étoient des gens qui étoient paſſez premierement du Paganiſme dans le Judaïſme, et qui reçurent enſuite la Religion Chrêtienne. Vid. Le Clerc. in Gal. i. 6.

a Τὰ πάντα δέ εἰσιν Ἰεδαῖοι, καὶ ἀδὲν ἕτερον——καὶ ὡς οἱ Ἰεδαῖοι πάντα καλῶς ὁμολογοῦσι, χωρὶς τῦ εἰς Χριςὸν δεδθεν πεπιςευκέναι. Hæreſ. 29. §. 7.

b Vid. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25. et 27.

Coroll.

Coroll. If in the Apoſtles' times, while they were yet alive, there were ſo many ſpurious and ſuppoſititious pieces publiſhed, it is not ſtrange, if we find a much greater number after their deaths, as the Chriſtian Religion ſpread farther; of which in the following Chapter.

CHAP. III.

A large Catalogue of all the loſt Apocryphal Books, which are mentioned by the Writers of the firſt four Centuries, with the Places, where they are mentioned.

HAVING given ſome account of the Apocryphal books under the Apoſtles' names during their life, I proceed now to give ſome account of *the vaſt number of ſuch books, that were in the world ſoon afterwards.*

Papias of Hierapolis, who was one of St. John's diſciples, an intimate of Polycarp, and called *a perſon of antiquity* by Irenæus [c], who himſelf lived in the ſecond century, tells us [d], in the Preface of his Commentary on our Saviour's ſayings, that *the books he had read concerning Chriſt were not ſo profitable to him, as the converſation of thoſe, who had been intimate with the Apoſtles*; which, as he never would have ſaid concerning any inſpired books, ſhews he had met with ſeveral, which he did not look upon as ſuch [e].

Hegeſippus (contemporary with Juſtin Martyr about the year of Chriſt 150, called by Gobarus [f] ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικὸς) in his Commentaries has a Diſcourſe concerning the Apocryphal books, *ſeveral of which*, he ſays, *were made by the Hereticks of his time* [g].

[c] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 5. c. 33.

[d] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.

[e] If he had judged them the undoubted writings of the Apoſtles, he muſt have been better ſatisfied therewith, than any uncertain traditions.

[f] Vid. Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 232. p. 894.

[g] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 22.

Irenæus

Irenæus [h] obſerves, that *the Gnoſticks had in his time an innumerable multitude of ſpurious and Apocryphal books*, which they had forged to delude the more weak and ignorant ſort of perſons, filled with the moſt impious and blaſphemous aſſertions. After theſe times, Origen [i], Jerome [k], Epiphanius [l], Ambroſe [m], and others, tell us of great numbers of theſe books, made uſe of by the Hereticks of their times. Philaſtrius, in his catalogue of Hereſies, names one *Hæreſis Apocrypha* [n], viz. of ſuch, who oppoſed other books to the truly Canonical ones.

Of theſe books *ſome are quite loſt*, and not ſo much as the name, or the leaſt part of them remaining. Of others *there are ſome few fragments* remaining in the writings of the Fathers, but without any expreſs intimation, out of what books they were taken. *Of others there are undoubted fragments*, with the names of the books, from whence they were cited. *Others perhaps are ſtill extant.*

For the better managing my deſign, I ſhall conſider them under the general diviſion of books which are loſt, and books which are yet extant; and, according to my propoſal, treat firſt *concerning thoſe which are loſt, or not extant.* And as it is neceſſary to my deſign, ſo I hope it will not be unſerviceable, to preſent the Reader with as large and full a collection of theſe, as I have been able to make, from the writers of the four firſt centuries after the birth of Chriſt: my collection proceeds no farther for theſe three reaſons, viz.

1. Becauſe by the end of the fourth century, or thereabouts, *there will appear to be almoſt an univerſal agreement concerning the Canon*, and what books ſhould be received into it.

2. Becauſe the writers of the *ſucceeding centuries are, upon many accounts, very improper evidences in this matter.*

3. Becauſe the books mentioned afterwards under the names of the Apoſtles, &c. *have either very ſlender, or indeed no pretences at all, to Canonical authority.* Such are many of thoſe

[h] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 17.
[i] Homil. in Luc. i. 1.
[k] Præf. in Matth.
[l] Adv. Hæreſ. ſæpe.
[m] Comment. in Luc. i. 1.
[n] Hæreſ. 87.

mentioned

mentioned in Mr. Toland's catalogue, under the pompous titles of St. Matthew, Mark, &c.

For theſe reaſons I have ſpared myſelf the needleſs labour of reading, or ſearching into the writers of the fifth, and following centuries; and ſhall now proceed to the catalogue itſelf.

A Catalogue of Books not extant now, formerly publiſhed under the Names of our Saviour, his Apoſtles, their Companions, &c. with the Places, where they are mentioned by any of the Writers of the firſt four Centuries after Chriſt.

N. B. The reader is not to think it ſtrange, when he finds the ſame book mentioned in this Catalogue more than once; my deſign being to produce every place, where there is any mention of them.

In the Firſt Century.

AFTER the moſt diligent ſearch into the ſuppoſed writers of the firſt century, I cannot find, that any one of them has mentioned ſo much as one Apocryphal writing by name. Barnabas, Hermas, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, in the pieces now extant under their names, never, in any one place, cite by name any Apocryphal Goſpel. It muſt indeed be confeſſed, there are ſeveral paſſages in their writings, which, as they are not in our Goſpels, ſeem to be taken out of ſome others: but theſe are all ſome ſayings of our Saviour, which, with whatever others are to be found of the ſame ſort, ſhall be produced, and critically examined, in the ſecond part of this work.

It may not, however, be improper here to obſerve, that there are two or three paſſages, from whence ſome have concluded, that beſide thoſe Epiſtles we now have of St. Paul's, he wrote others, now loſt. For inſtance, from thoſe words, 1 Cor. v. 9. *I wrote to you, in an Epiſtle, not to company with fornicators*; they conclude, he had ſent the Corinthians an Epiſtle before that, which is now called the firſt. And Mr. Gregory of Oxford * tells us, *he ſaw a third Epiſtle of St.*

* Preface to his works, p. 11.

Paul

Paul to the Corinthians, in the Armenian tongue, beginning, Paul a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt; but this, and the other inſtances, I deſign particularly to examine hereafter.

In the SECOND CENTURY *the following Apocryphal Books are mentioned.*

By HEGESIPPUS.

The Goſpel according to the Hebrews. *Lib. Commentar. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib.* 4. *c.* 22.

By IRENÆUS.

The Goſpel written by Judas Iſcariot. *Adverſ. Hæreſ. lib.* 1. *c.* 35.

The Goſpel of Truth, made uſe of by the Valentinians. *Id. lib.* 3. *c.* 11.

By HERACLEON.

The Preaching of Peter. *Apud Origen. lib.* 14. *Comment. in Joan.* iv. 22.

By SERAPION, Biſhop of Antioch.

The Goſpel of Peter. *Lib. de Evang. Pet. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 6. *c.* 12.

Dr. Cave ſaith [o], Serapion has cited the Acts of Peter; but I believe he is miſtaken in this matter, there being nothing of it in Euſebius.

By APOLLONIUS.

A Catholick Epiſtle of Themiſon the Montaniſt, forged in imitation of the Apoſtles. *Lib. cont. Cataphryg. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 5. c. 18.

By CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS.

The Goſpel according to the Hebrews. *Stromat. l.* 2. *p.* 380.

o Hiſtor. Liter. in Petrus, p. 5.

The

The Gospel according to the Egyptians. *Lib.* 3. *p.* 452, 465. See also p. 445.

The Traditions of Matthias. *Lib.* 2. *p.* 380. *Lib.* 7. *p.* 748. See also *Lib.* 3. *p.* 436.

The Preaching of Peter, or, according to some, of Paul and Peter, as one book. *Lib.* 1. *p.* 357. *l.* 2. *p.* 390. *l.* 6. *p.* 635, 636, et 678.

The Revelation of Peter. *Lib. Hypotopos. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib.* 6. *c.* 14.

By THEODOTUS BYZANTIUS.

The Preaching of Peter. *Excerpt. seu Eclog. p.* 809. printed after the end of Clemens Alexandrinus's Works.

The Revelation of Peter. *Ibid. p.* 806, 807.

By TERTULLIAN.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla. *Lib. de Baptism. c.* 17. About twenty-three years since, our learned countryman, Dr. Mills, caused the Martyrdom of Thecla to be copied out of the Greek manuscript in the Bodleian Library, and presented it to Dr. Grabe, who has since published it in his Spicileg. Patr. Secul. I. and endeavours to prove it to be the same with this Book mentioned by Tertullian. How right his conjecture is, will appear when we come to examine the Book itself.

The Gospel of Valentinus. *Lib. de Præscript. adv. Hæretic. c.* 49.

The Gospel of Marcion. *Lib.* 4. *adv. Marcion. c.* 2, 4, et 6.

The Gospel of Peter. *Ibid. c.* 5.

By CAIUS, a Presbyter of Rome.

The Revelation of Cerinthus, pretending to be Apostolical. *Lib. Disput. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 28.

In the THIRD CENTURY, *the following Apocryphal Books are mentioned.*

By ORIGEN.

The Gospel according to the Egyptians. *Homil. in Luc.* i. 1.

The

The Goſpel according to the twelve Apoſtles. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Baſilides. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Thomas. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Matthias. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Peter. *Comment. in Matth.* xiii. 55, 56. *Tom.* i *p.* 223.
The Book of James. *Ibid.*
The Doctrine of Peter. *Procem. in Libr. de Princip.*
The Goſpel according to the Hebrews. *Tract.* 8. *in Matth.* xix. 19.
The ſame. *Tom.* 2. *in Joan. p.* 58.
The Acts of Paul. *De Princip. l.* 1. *c.* 2.
The ſame. *Tom.* 2. *in Joan. p.* 298.

By CYPRIAN.

A ſpurious piece under the name of Paul, *Epiſt.* 27.
By an anonymous writer in Cyprian's time,
The Preaching of Paul. *Tract. de non iterand. Baptiſm. p.* 30. at the end of Cyprian's works.

By LACTANTIUS.

The Preaching of Peter and Paul at Rome. *De Verâ Sap. l.* 4. *c.* 21.

* *In the* FOURTH CENTURY *are mentioned the following Books.*

By EUSEBIUS.

The Acts of Peter. *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 3.
The Goſpel of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Preaching of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Revelation of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Acts of Paul. *Ibid.*
The ſame. *Lib.* 3. *c.* 25.

* Porphyry, in his life of Plotinus, accuſes the Chriſtians with having forged ſeveral books, under the title of Revelations, viz. of Zoroaſter, Zoſtrianus, Nicotheus, Allogenes, Meſus, and ſeveral others.

The

The Goſpel according to the Hebrews. *Ibid.*
The Revelation of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Thomas. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Matthias. *Ibid.*
The Acts of Andrew and John. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel according to the Hebrews. *c.* 39.
The Goſpel of Tatian. *Lib.* 4. *c.* 29.
The Book of the Helkeſaites, which, they ſay, fell down from Heaven. *Lib.* 6. *c.* 38.

By ATHANASIUS.

The Acts of Peter. *Synopſ. S. Scriptur.* §. 76.*
The Acts of John. *Ibid.*
The Acts of Thomas. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Thomas. *Ibid.*

By CYRIL.

The Goſpel of Thomas. *Catech.* IV. §. 36. and *Catech.* VI. §. 31.
The Goſpel of Scythianus. *Catech.* VI. §. 22.

By AMBROSE.

The Goſpel of the Twelve Apoſtles. *Comment. in Luc.* i. 1.
The Goſpel of Baſilides. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Thomas. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Matthias. *Ibid.*

By the anonymous Author of the Works under the name of DIONYSIUS the AREOPAGITE.

The writings of Bartholomew the Apoſtle. *Lib. de Theol. Myſtic. c.* 1.

* I confeſs, it has been much queſtioned, whether that book, under the name of Athanaſius, be really his, or not: but though I thought it neceſſary to mention this here, yet it is not very material to our deſign, whether it was written by him, or any other perſon in or near his time.

By PHILASTRIUS.

The Acts of Andrew. *Hæref.* 87.
The Acts of John. *Ibid.*
The Acts of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Acts of Paul. *Ibid.*

By JEROME.

The Goſpel according to the Egyptians. *Præf. in Comment. in Matth.*
The Goſpel of Thomas. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Matthias. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Bartholomew. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of the Twelve Apoſtles. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Baſilides. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Apelles. *Ibid.*
The Goſpel of Peter. *Catal. Script. Eccleſ. in Petr.*
The Acts of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Preaching of Peter. *Ibid.*
The Revelation of Peter.
The Book of Judgment by Peter. *Ibid.*
The Goſpels publiſhed by Lucianus and Heſychius. *Præfat. in Evang. ad Damaſ.*
The Acts of the Apoſtles, by Leuthon, or Seleucus. *Epiſt. ad Chromat. et Heliodor. inter Opp. Hieronymi.**
The Viſion, or Acts of Paul and Thecla. *Catal. Script. Eccleſ. in Luc.*
The Goſpel of Bartholomew. *Ibid. in Pantæn.*
The Goſpel according to the Hebrews, or Nazarenes. *Ibid. in Matth. et Jacob. Adv. Pelag. l. 3. c. 1. Comment. in Iſai.* xi. 2. *et* xl. 11. *in Ezek.* xviii. 7. *in Mic.* vii. 6. Several places in his Commentary on Matthew, *viz.* vi. 11. xii. 13. xxiii. 35. *Vid. Grab. Spicileg. Patr. Tom.* 1. p. 30.

By EPIPHANIUS.

The Goſpel of Perfection. *Hæref.* 26. *Gnoſtic.* §. 2.

* Some have imagined this Epiſtle not to be Jerome's. See Sixt. Senens. Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. et Caſaub. Exercit. 1. ad Apparat. Baron. Annal. N. 39. init.

The

The Goſpel of Eve. *Ibid.*

The Goſpel of Philip. *Ibid.* §. 13.

The Goſpel of the Nazarenes. *Hæreſ.* 29. §. 9.

The Goſpel of the Ebionites. *Hæreſ.* 30. §. 13.

The Acts of the Apoſtles, made uſe of by the Ebionites, different from Luke's. *Ibid.* §. 16.

Books forged by the Ebionites under the names of John, James, Matthew, and others of our Lord's Diſciples. *Ibid.* §. 23.

The Acts of Peter. *Ibid.* §. 15.

The Goſpel of Jude. *Hæreſ.* 38. *Caian.* §. 1.

The Anabaticon, or Revelation of Paul. *Ibid.* §. 2.

The Goſpel of Marcion. *Hæreſ.* 42. *Procem. Refut*

The Goſpel of the Encratites. *Hæreſ.* 46. §. 1.

The Acts of Andrew, John, and Thomas. *Hæreſ.* 47. §. 1.

The Goſpel of Cerinthus. *Hæreſ.* 51. §. 7.

* The Goſpel of Merinthus. *Ibid.*

The Acts of Andrew and Thomas. *Hæreſ.* 61. §. 1.

The Goſpel of the Egyptians. *Hæreſ.* 62. §. 2.

The Acts of Andrew. *Hæreſ.* 63. §. 2.

The Goſpel of Scythianus. *Hæreſ.* 66. §. 2.

By AUSTIN.

Some Books, which claimed our Saviour for their Author, in form of an Epiſtle to Peter and Paul. *De Conſenſ. Evang.* l. i. c. 9, 10.

Some other Books of our Saviour's. *Ibid.* c. 34.

An Epiſtle of Chriſt, produced by the Manichees. *Cont. Fauſt. Manich.* l. 28. c. 4.

A Hymn of Chriſt's, which he taught his Diſciples, received by the Priſcillianiſts, and other hereticks, as genuine. *Epiſt. ad Ceret. Epiſcop.*

Some Books under the names of John and Andrew. *Cont. Adverſ. Leg. et Prophet.* l. 1. c. 20.

* Theſe two of Cerinthus and Merinthus, he ſuppoſes, St. Luke intended in the firſt verſe of his Goſpel, among other Apocryphal ones, which were at that time written.

The Acts of Lentius*, under the names of the Apoſtles. *Lib. de Fid. contr. Manich.* c. 38.

The Acts of the Apoſtles, wrote by Lenticius†. *De Act. cum Fælic. Manich.* l. 2. c. 6.

The Acts of Leontius‡, under the Apoſtles' names. *Lib. de Fid. cont. Manich.* c. 5.

The Acts of the Apoſtles, made uſe of by the Manichees. *Lib. cont. Adimant. Manich.* c. 17.

The Revelation of Paul. *Tract.* 98. *in Joan. in fin.*

By RUFFIN.

The Judgment of Peter. *Expoſit. in Symbol. Apoſtol.* §. 36.

By INNOCENT I.

Books forged under the name of Matthias.

Books forged under the name of James the Leſs.

Books forged under the names of Peter and John, wrote by Lentius§.

Books forged under the name of Andrew, wrote by Nexocharistes** and Leonides.

Books forged under the name of Thomas. *Epiſt.* 3. *ad Exuper. Tholoſ. Epiſc.* §. 7.

By GELASIUS.

The Acts of Andrew.

The Acts of Philip.

The Acts of Peter.

The Acts of Thomas.

The Goſpel of Thaddæus.

The Goſpel of Matthias.

The Goſpel of Thomas.

The Goſpel of Barnabas.

The Goſpel of Bartholomew.

The Goſpel of Andrew.

The Goſpels corrupted by Lucian.

The Goſpels corrupted by Heſychius††.

The Books of Lentitius‡‡.

* Al. Leucius.
† Al. Leucius et Levitius.
‡ Al. Leucius.
§ Leucius.
** Al. Xenocharides.
†† Al. Iſtius.
‡‡ Al. Leucius.

The

The Acts of Thecla and Paul.

The Revelation of Thomas.

The Revelation of Paul.

The Revelation of Stephen. See the decree under Gelaſius's name, *de Libris Apocryph. apud Gratian. Diſtinct.* 15. c. 3*. Whether, as ſome imagine, it was wrote within my time, or no, I ſhall not here enquire; only obſerve, that if it was not, it was ſo very near it, that I thought it neceſſary to inſert it.

Theſe are all the Apocryphal books, not extant, which I have been able to find any mention of in the writers of the four firſt centuries after our Saviour. I propoſed, indeed, to have annexed here the catalogue of the books ſtill extant in like manner as the not extant; but this catalogue will be ſo neceſſary in the third part of this work, that I ſhall defer the producing it in full, or at large, till then; and in the mean time deſire the reader to be content with the following general account.

The Apocryphal Books extant are, ſuch as

Our Saviour's Letter to Abgarus.

Our Saviour's Letter, which fell down from Heaven at Jeruſalem, directed to a Prieſt named Leopas, in the City Eris.

The Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles.

The Creed of the Apoſtles.

The Apoſtolical Epiſtles of Barnabas, Clemens, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

The Shepherd of Hermas.

The Goſpel of the Infancy of our Saviour.

The Prot-Evangelium of St. James.

The Goſpel of Nicodemus.

The Martyrdom of Thecla, or Acts of Paul.

Abdias's Hiſtory of the Twelve Apoſtles.

St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Laodiceans.

St. Paul's Six Letters to Seneca, &c.

Upon the whole, we may ſee, how great the number of ſpurious and Apocryphal pieces was in the ages next after our Saviour.

* Et apud Concil. Sanct. Tom. 4. p. 1260.

CHAP. IV.

Reaſons aſſigned, why there were ſo many Apocryphal Pieces ſo early in the Chriſtian Church.

MANY who are not acquainted with the firſt writers of Chriſtianity, will, no doubt, be ſurprized to ſee ſo large a catalogue of books, ſo early written under ſuch ſpecious titles: before I proceed therefore, it may not be improper to obſerve, *how it came to paſs that the number of them became ſo large, or for what reaſons they were wrote.* And,

1. *The very great number of hereſies and diviſions, that aroſe among the Chriſtians ſoon after the publiſhing of the Goſpel, I aſſign as the principal cauſe of this multitude of books.* It is indeed ſtrange, that a religion ſo exactly calculated to promote unity, ſhould have been ſo much abuſed, and its profeſſors divided into ſo many various parties, and different denominations, as we find they were immediately after our Lord's Aſcenſion. Hegeſippus indeed tells us[p], that *till Trajan's time* (near which himſelf lived) *the Church continued as a pure and uncorrupted virgin:* but this (as learned men have obſerved) muſt be candidly underſtood[q], not as though there were at this time no hereſies aroſe in the Church, but that they had not yet ſo much ſpread themſelves, and diſturbed the peace of the Church: for it is certain, that even in the Apoſtles' times many had perverted the great truths of Chriſtianity; St. Paul often hints at ſuch in his Epiſtles[r]; Peter[s] and Jude[t] do the ſame; and John expreſsly mentions the Nicolaitans and others[u]. In their time lived Simon Magus, to whom ſo many hereſies owed their original. It would be tedious to mention the hereſies of the ſecond century, the various ſorts of Gnoſticks[w],

[p] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 32. et l. 4. c. 22.

[q] Valeſ. ad prior. loc. Euſeb. et Spanheim. Hiſtor. Chriſtian. Secul. I. §. 14. init.

[r] 2 Cor. xi. 26. Gal. i. 6, &c. ii. 4, &c. 2 Tim. ii. 17.

[s] 2 Pet. iii. 16.

[t] Jude 4. et 12.

[u] Rev. ii. 15. et 20.

[w] The learned Dr. Hammond, in his Annotations on St. Paul's Epiſtles, meets with them continually there.

the

the Valentinians, Menandrians, Nicolaitans, &c. the Nazarenes, Ebionites, Cerinthians, Carpocratians, Montaniſts, the followers of Cerdon, Marcion, Tatian, &c. He who has a mind, may ſee large catalogues of theſe in Irenæus, Epiphanius, Auſtin, &c. What concerns me to obſerve is, that upon account of, theſe differing parties, a great part of thoſe books were compoſed, which make up the foregoing catalogue; each party to recommend and propagate their principles and tenets under the great name of ſome Apoſtle or Diſciple of our Saviour. This will largely appear in the particular examination of the books; at preſent it will be ſufficient, to ſupport the obſervation from the expreſs teſtimonies of ſome antient writers.

Irenæus [x] tells us, *the Gnoſticks had in his time forged an innumerable multitude of ſpurious and Apocryphal books, which they ſpread abroad in order to pervert ignorant and unwary perſons.* Hegeſippus who lived at the ſame time, in a diſſertation concerning the Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament [y], aſſures us, *they were many of them made by the heretics of that age.* If any regard be to be given to the Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles, not as a ſacred, but an antient book, we are there told [z], *the ungodly wrote ſeveral books in their name; that Simon and Cleobius, and their followers, did compile poiſonous books under the name of Chriſt and his Diſciples, and do carry them about in order to deceive, &c.*

2. It is not improbable, *that ſome of the forementioned books were compoſed by honeſt and pious men, with deſign to preſerve ſome miracles and diſcourſes of our Saviour, which they had received by an undoubted tradition, and did not meet with in any of the authentic Goſpels.* It can hardly be thought, but Papias, and ſuch others, who, like him, were ſo induſtrious in procuring all accounts they could of our Lord's ſayings and ac-

[x] Adverſ. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 17. Ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν, ἃς αὐτοὶ ἔπλασαν, παρεισφέρουσιν εἰς κατάπληξιν τῶν ἀνοήτων, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μὴ ἐπισταμένων γράμματα.

[y] Ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ χρόνων πρὸς τινῶν αἱρετικῶν ἀναπεπλάσθαι τινὰ τούτων (ſc. ἀποκρύφων) ἱστορεῖ. Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 22.

[z] Conſt. Apoſt. l. 6. §. 16.

tions, would, out of the ſame principle, tranſmit them to others; which accounts, falling afterwards into the hands of ſome zealous and well-meaning perſons, were, either through miſtake, or perhaps a more pious than honeſt deſign, publiſhed under the name of ſome one of our Lord's Apoſtles or followers, and that ſometimes with many additions and interpolations. The learned Caſaubon (than whom no one was either more acquainted with, or more judicious in Chriſtian antiquities) has obſerved this, in his diſſertations againſt Baronius [a]; *I cannot*, ſays he, *but much reſent the practice of many in the earlieſt ages of the Church, who reckoned it an action very meritorious to make additions of their own to the truths of the Goſpel, with this view, that Chriſtianity might meet with a better reception among the Gentiles.* They called theſe, officious lies, contrived for a pious end. This produced innumerable books in thoſe ages, wrote by men who were not bad, under the name of our Saviour, his Apoſtles, and followers. Among theſe books, that excellent critic places the Sibylline Oracles, and ſeveral of the preceding catalogue. But, of all theſe, none ſeems to me more likely to have proceeded from this cauſe, than that famous book in antiquity, entitled, The Preaching of Peter and Paul. I would only add, that Tertullian [b] and Jerome have furniſhed us with an undoubted and remarkable inſtance of this, in the book called, The Acts of Paul and Thecla: *this ſpurious piece* (ſay thoſe authors) *was wrote by a certain Preſbyter in Aſia, under the name of Paul, who being convicted of the forgery, confeſſed it, and ſaid, he did it out of love to Paul, &c.* [c]

[a] Exercit. 1. cont. Baron. Annal. N. 10. p. 54.

[b] Lib. de Baptiſm. c. 17.

[c] Vid. Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Luc.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

A general Proof, that the primitive Chriſtians were well agreed about the Books of the Canon.

PROP. II.

The greateſt Part of Chriſtians were very early agreed, what Books were Canonical, and to be looked upon as the Rule of Faith and Practice.

IT would certainly evidence a very great ignorance in Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory in any perſon, to pretend to aſſign the particular time, when the preſent collection, or Canon of the books of the New Teſtament, was made: for though we have all imaginable reaſon to conclude this certainly done long before the Council of Laodicea, yet the hiſtories of thoſe times are ſo defective, that we have no poſitive account of that matter. The Canon was indeed gradually enlarged, as the books were wrote at different times, and in places at a very great diſtance from each other; and ſo a conſiderable time was neceſſarily requiſite, both for the ſpreading the books, and certifying their genuineneſs and authority. It is impoſſible in the nature of things, but ſome Churches muſt receive the books long after others, as they lay at a greater diſtance from the places where they were written, or had leſs convenience of communication with them. Beſides, Chriſtianity for a long time laboured under the diſadvantages of continual perſecution; no general Councils could be convened, and ſo no public notification of univerſal agreement in this matter. But notwithſtanding all theſe things, it is yet diſcoverable, that, as ſoon as can be ſuppoſed after the writing of the books, the Chriſtians in all countries remarkably agreed in receiving them as Canonical: for the proof of which I obſerve,

1. *That in the few genuine writings of the firſt ages now extant, the ſame books are cited as Scripture.* It is indeed, without juſt reaſon, commonly preſumed, that the firſt writers cited

cited the now-received books of the Canon, *and others promiſcuouſly*. But as I ſhall hereafter ſhew this to be a miſtake, ſo it will be enough here to obſerve, that they were generally agreed in receiving the ſame books for Canonical, which we do now; and this appears, I ſay, from their agreement to cite them, as every one muſt acknowledge, who has but caſt an eye upon the writings of the firſt centuries. To ſay nothing of the Apoſtolic Fathers, ſuch as Clemens, Barnabas, &c. it is evident, that Juſtin Martyr at Neapolis, Theophilus at Antioch, Irenæus in France, Clemens at Alexandria, Tertullian at Carthage, &c. (who all lived within 120 or 130 years after our Lord's Aſcenſion, and ſome of them much ſooner, and but a very ſhort time after the writing of the books) have all, though in very remote countries, quoted many, or moſt, if not all the ſame books as Scripture. The ſame might be obſerved concerning Origen, Cyprian, and other writers of the next century. But, to omit theſe, I obſerve,

2. *That ſeveral of the firſt writers of Chriſtianity have left us, in their works, catalogues of the ſacred books of the New Teſtament*, which, though made in countries at a vaſt diſtance from each other, do very little differ. A particular account of all the catalogues, I ſhall give hereafter in this volume; I ſhall only inſtance now in thoſe of Origen [d] and Euſebius [e], which he who will be at the pains to compare, will eaſily perceive to be very nearly the ſame. So great was the pains and care of thoſe early Chriſtians, to be well aſſured what were the genuine writings of the Apoſtles, and to diſtinguiſh them from all the pretended Revelations of deſigning men, and the forgeries they publiſhed under ſacred titles. Thus when the Preſbyter of Aſia abovementioned [f] had publiſhed a ſpurious piece under the name of Paul, *he was immediately convicted, and notice of the forgery was ſoon conveyed to Carthage, and the Churches of Africa.*

Coroll. I. Hence it follows, that Mr. Dodwell's opinion [g],

[d] Comment. in Matth. init. et Comment. in Joan. l. 5. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.

[e] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.

[f] Vid. ſupr. p. 40.

[g] In Iren. Diſſert. I. §. 38.

eſpouſed

eſpouſed with ſo much zeal by Mr. Toland in his Amyntor [h], is utterly falſe, viz. *That the books of the preſent Canon lay concealed in the coffers of particular Churches, or private men, till the later times of Trajan, or perhaps of Adrian, not known to the Clergy or Churches of thoſe times, nor yet diſtinguiſhed from the ſpurious pieces of the Hereticks.* For beſides that it has been already proved, by Mr. Nye [i] and Mr. Le Clerc [k], that the writers of the Apoſtolic age were well acquainted with, becauſe they frequently cite ſeveral books of, our preſent Canon; I add, from what has been ſaid, that if theſe books had not been well known in Adrian's time, but then lay concealed, it would have been impoſſible for them to have ſpread ſo much by the middle of the ſecond century, as to have been quoted by all the writers of it, in whatever countries they lived [l].

Coroll. II. Hence it alſo follows, *that the primitive Chriſtians are proper judges, to determine what book is Canonical, and what not*; for nothing can be more abſurd, than to ſuppoſe, in thoſe early ages, an agreement ſo univerſal, without a good and ſolid foundation; or, in other words, it is next to impoſſible, either that ſo great a number of men ſhould agree in a cheat, or be impoſed upon by a cheat. The celebrated Huetius takes this for granted, and lays it down as his firſt axiom, *That every book is genuine, which was eſteemed genuine by thoſe, who lived neareſt to the time when it was written, and by the ages ſucceeding in a continued ſeries. This*, ſays he, *is an axiom that cannot be diſputed by thoſe, who will allow any thing at all to be certain in hiſtory.* Demonſtr. Evang. Axiom. 1. But there are ſome particular circumſtances, which will make the inference more clear as to the Chriſtian books, than others, ſuch as *the prodigious eſteem the books at firſt were received with, the conſtant uſe that was made of them in their religious aſſemblies, the tranſlations made of them very early into other lan-*

[h] Amynt. p. 69.

[i] Anſwer to Amyntor, p. 47, &c. See my Vindic. of St. Matth. p. 225, &c.

[k] Differt. 3. at the end of his Harmony.

[l] Juſtin Martyr unqueſtionably lived in Adrian's time, and Irenæus not long after. Vid. Euſeb. Chronic.

guages;

guages; theſe, I ſay, and many other ſuch circumſtances there are, which all concur to make an impoſture in this caſe almoſt impoſſible.

CHAP. VI.

The various Sentiments of learned Men concerning the Methods of determining the Canonical Authority of any Book, enquired into, and particularly diſcuſſed.

PROP. III.

The main and principal Method, by which we are now able to determine the Canonical Authority of any Book, or Books, is by ſearching into the moſt antient and authentic Records of Chriſtianity, and finding out the Teſtimony or Tradition of thoſe, who lived neareſt the Time in which the Books were written, concerning them.

THE preceding Corollary evidenced the firſt Chriſtians to be proper judges; the deſign of this propoſition is to ſhew, that they are the main and principal judges, by whom we muſt determine the queſtion concerning the Canon of the New Teſtament. Though the propoſition may at firſt ſeem clear and evident, the diſputes of many, both foreign and Engliſh divines, have made it neceſſary more largely to be diſcuſſed: for the truth is, it has happened here, as in many other caſes, the cleareſt truths have become ſtrangely perplexed and confounded. Such is the zeal of the contending parties among Chriſtians, that becauſe they differ in ſome things, they think themſelves obliged to differ in all they can, and ſo ariſe diſputes about queſtions, which are in themſelves plain, and the fierceſt contention about things, in which both ſides would moſt certainly agree, if they had but patience and impartiality enough to know each other's meaning. This is in a great meaſure the caſe in the preſent queſtion, concerning the

the authority of the Scriptures: ſome tell us, *they derive their authority from the Church*; others, that *they can only rightly appear to be true from their own internal evidence, and their powerful influence on the heart*; others add to this, *the inward teſtimony of the Spirit evidencing their divinity*, and conſequently *their genuineneſs*; others laſtly are perſuaded, we have no other way of knowing whether any book was written by the perſon whoſe name it bears, and conſequently whether it be of the authority it pretends to derive from its author, *but by well-approved teſtimonies of thoſe, who lived in or near the time of its being firſt written.* I ſhall firſt give ſome brief account of each of theſe opinions, and then endeavour to ſhew what is moſt probable upon the whole.

1. *The firſt is the opinion of the Papiſts*, who have generally affirmed, in their controverſies with the Proteſtants, that *the authority of the Scriptures depends upon, or is derived from, the power of their Church*: i. e. *It is in the power of the Pope, or Council, or both, to determine what books ſhall be received as Canonical.* This is a matter ſo well known, that I ſhall not produce many inſtances to prove it. Hermannus, in the abundance of his zeal, affirms [m] *the Scriptures are of no more value than Æſop's Fables, without the authority of the Church*; and Bailius [n], *that he ſhould give no more credit to Saint Matthew, than Livy, unleſs the Church obliged him.* Tiletanus, biſhop of Ypres, ſays, *This is the only way of diſtinguiſhing between Canonical and Apocryphal Scriptures* [o]. To the ſame purpoſe Pighius, Eckius, Bellarmine, and many of their moſt celebrated writers [p]. By the authority of the Church, theſe authors plainly mean a power lodged in the Church of Rome, and her ſynods, of determination, what books are the word of God; than which nothing can be more abſurd, or contradictory to common ſenſe: for if ſo, it is poſſible, nay it

[m] Apud Whitaker. Controv. de Script. Quæſt. 3. c. 1. et Chemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. Par. 1. p. 85.

[n] Rivet. Iſag. ad Script. Sacr. c. 3. §. 4. &c.

[o] Ibid. c. 3. §. 3.

[p] Ibid. c. 3. §. 3, 4, &c. Whitaker. Controv. de Script. Sacr. Quæſt. 3. c. 1. Amyrald. Theſ. de Auctor. Script. inter Theſ. Salmurienſes. Calvin. Inſtit. Chriſt. Rel. l. 1. c. 7. §. 1.

is

is eaſy for them, to make a book, which is not divine, to be ſo; and (to make uſe of Hermannus's inſtance) it is poſſible Æſop's Fables may in time become as good a part of Scripture, as Saint Paul's Epiſtles: nay, once more, it is very poſſible the books of Celſus, Julian, and Porphyry, were they extant, might become a part of the New Teſtament, though they were deſignedly written againſt it. But the folly of the Popiſh arguments in this inſtance, has been ſo well expoſed by Whitaker, Chemnitius, Rivet, and many others of our Reformers, that I think it ſufficient to refer the Reader, who has a mind to know more of this controverſy, to their books cited in the margin.

2. Others are of opinion, that *there are inward, or innate evidences in the Scriptures, which, applied by the illumination or teſtimony of the Holy Spirit, are the only true proofs of their being Canonical, or the word of God.* To avoid the tedious and prolix diſputations, that have been on this head between Papiſts and Proteſtants, and even between Proteſtants themſelves, I ſhall only give ſome account of the ſentiments of our Reformers on it, out of their own writings, and then examine how far they are true.

Among the Proteſtants who have declared their opinion againſt the Papiſts on this head, I place firſt our learned countryman Whitaker, who, in his controverſy about the Scripture againſt Bellarmine, gives us this account of the reformed doctrine in this matter [q]: *The ſum*, ſays he, *of our opinion is, that the Scriptures have all their authority and credit from themſelves; that they are to be acknowledged and received, not becauſe the Church has appointed or commanded ſo, but becauſe they came from God: but that they came from God, cannot be certainly known by the Church, but from the Holy Ghoſt.* So Calvin [r]: *All muſt allow, that there are in the Scriptures manifeſt evidences of God ſpeaking in them. The majeſty of God in them will preſently appear to every impartial examiner, which will extort our aſſent: ſo that they act prepoſterouſly, who endeavour by any argument to beget a ſolid credit to the Scrip-*

[q] Controv. de Script. Quæſt. 3. c. 1.

[r] Inſtit. Chriſt. Relig. l. 1. c. 7. §. 4, 5.

tures

tures—The Word will never meet with credit in men's minds, till it be ſealed by the internal teſtimony of the Spirit, who wrote it. Much the ſame we meet with in the publick Confeſſions of faith ſet forth by the reformed Churches; for inſtance, in the Dutch Confeſſion, publiſhed in French in 1566, in the name of all the Belgian Churches, after having recited a catalogue of the Scriptures, *Theſe*, ſay they, *we receive as the only ſacred and Canonical books, not becauſe the Church receives them as ſuch, but becauſe the Holy Spirit witneſſeth to our conſciences* [s], *that they proceeded from God, and themſelves teſtify their authority* [t].

The Gallican Church, in their Confeſſion, go ſomewhat farther [u]; not only declaring their faith in the Scriptures to depend upon the teſtimony and internal perſuaſion of the Spirit, *but that hereby they knew the Canonical from Eccleſiaſtical:* i. e. *Apocryphal books.* I ſhould proceed no farther in citations to this purpoſe, were it not for the zealous aſſertions of a Divine famous among us in England, whoſe own words are [w], *The Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament do abundantly and uncontroulably manifeſt themſelves to be the word of the living God; ſo that merely on the account of their own propoſal to us, in the name and majeſty of God as ſuch, without the contribution of help or aſſiſtance from tradition, Church, or any thing elſe without themſelves, we are obliged, upon the penalty of eternal damnation, to receive them with that ſubjection of ſoul, which is due to the word of God. The authority of God ſhining in them, they afford unto us all the divine evidence of themſelves, which God is willing to grant to us, or can be granted to us, or is any way needful for us.* Such have been the aſſertions of the Reformers, and many great men after them; which, for my part, I freely own, ſeem to be of a very extraordinary nature. For though I would by no means detract, either from the dignity of the Canon, or from the influences of God's

[s] Happy men! who, in ſuch numbers, were bleſſed with ſo ſatisfying an evidence.

[t] Confeſſ. Belgic. Art. 5.

[u] Confeſſ. Gallic. Art. 4.

[w] See Dr. Owen's Diſcourſe concerning the Divine Original of the Scripture, Ch. 2. §. 5. and Ch. 4, 5.

Holy

Holy Spirit (to whom we certainly owe more than we commonly imagine), yet I can by no means think the doctrine of our Reformers in this matter to be very evident and clear; for neither by the internal evidences of the Scriptures themſelves, nor the teſtimony of the Spirit attending them, do men generally believe, that the Scriptures of the preſent Canon are the word of God. To conſider each diſtinctly;

1. *As to the internal evidences of the Scriptures*, I readily grant, they are ſuch as beſpeak them plainly to be the moſt excellent books in the world; but that theſe are ſuch as will prove, or ought to extort our aſſent to, their divinity, upon pain of eternal damnation, without any other arguments, ſeems to be a very unguarded and groundleſs poſition. Were the great number of Apocryphal books and Epiſtles, under the names of the Apoſtles, now extant, and had they happened to have been put in and continued in the Canon till now, is it likely, is it poſſible, that every Chriſtian, who now believes the Scripture to be the word of God, would have diſtinguiſhed between theſe and the books we now receive, by the divinity and majeſty that appear in the one above the other? Can it be ſuppoſed, that out of a hundred books, or, as we may well ſuppoſe, out of ten thouſand (for the argument will be juſt the ſame with the largeſt aſſignable number) that private Chriſtians, or even our moſt learned Reformers, ſhould by any internal evidence, agree preciſely on the number of twenty-ſeven, which are now eſteemed Canonical, induced thereto by ſome characters thoſe books contain, of their being written by the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt? Eſpecially when we conſider, how various and divided the ſentiments of Chriſtians are, who now agree in the ſame Canon? If of theſe books claiming and pretending to inſpiration under ſuch names, we are to judge of their inward evidences, without any external arguments from tradition, it is moſt certain each party would be proportionably fond of any book, as it more or leſs favoured their particular ſcheme of notions; and thoſe which we now know to be Apocryphal books, muſt have been judged Canonical above others, as they had more evidences of what they reckoned the mind of God, than others.

If

If men therefore are ſtript of all other ways of determining, to me it ſeems very clear, that, conſidering the zeal of the contending denominations of Chriſtians for their particular opinions, ſeveral of the books of the preſent Canon would have been rejected, and perhaps moſt of them in their turns by one party or other; and ſo nothing could enſue but perpetual quarrels and diſagreement. This will appear more probable, becauſe it was really matter of fact, in a great meaſure, in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity. It is well known that the hereticks of thoſe times, diſregarding the true teſtimony or tradition of the Church, and other rational arguments, wonderfully cried up their ſpurious pieces under Apoſtles' names, becauſe they favoured their peculiar ſyſtems. Thus, for inſtance, the Manichees rejected many of the books of the New Teſtament which we now receive, and ſubſtituted [x] others in their room; becauſe the former agreed, and the latter diſagreed, with thoſe ridiculous ideas they had formed of Chriſtianity; and ſo contemned all other proofs, that were brought by good teſtimonies, &c. to evidence that our preſent books were the only rule of faith. But the folly and madneſs, as St. Auſtin calls it, of this ſort of reaſoning, is ſo well confuted by that Father [y], that I need ſay no more. Thoſe therefore who are zealous for this ſort of proof, would do well to conſider, that this argument alone, without other external ones, does certainly make the Canon of Scripture uncertain, and lay men under a neceſſity of continual brangles and diſputes. St. Paul tells us, there were in the Church of Corinth *falſe Apoſtles, deceitful workers, transforming themſelves into the Apoſtles of Chriſt: and no marvel; for Satan himſelf is transformed into an angel of light* [z]: ſuch who would artfully imitate their doctrines. And if ſuch as they had publiſhed their books under the Apoſtles' names, imitating their ſtyle and doctrine, would it not have been exceeding difficult, yea, almoſt impoſſible, without ſome rational arguments, for the common Chriſtians at Corinth to have ſeen the clear evidences of divinity in

[x] Auguſt. cont. Fauſt. Manich. l. 32. c. 2.
[y] Ibid. l. 11. c. 2. et l. 33. c. 6.
[z] 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14.

the one, which were not in the other? Could they, without ſome other aſſiſtance, have been aſſured, that the firſt and ſecond Epiſtles, wrote to them under Paul's name, were his, and the third was not? Sure I am, St. Paul did not put the Chriſtians, to whom he wrote, upon this method of knowing the genuineneſs of his Epiſtles. Though he knew them to be from God, though he propoſed them as ſuch, yet he did not apprehend the evidences of their divinity were ſuch, as would always manifeſt them to be ſuch, and infallibly direct the Chriſtians to diſtinguiſh them from all ſpurious writings under his name: elſe what need of the caution he gives them againſt counterfeit Epiſtles, and a particular mark, which he made uſe of in all his Epiſtles, to diſtinguiſh his real ones from all ſuppoſititious ones[a]? This was certainly needleſs and ſuperfluous, if the books themſelves would extort aſſent from thoſe who read them. And if it be, as Calvin ſays, prepoſterous to endeavour, by any ſolid arguments, to beget a ſolid credit to the Scriptures, diſtinct from their internal evidence; then it was certainly prepoſterous in St. Paul to add that mark to his Epiſtles, as an evidence they were his. But perhaps it will be urged, that it is not the inward characters of the Scriptures alone, but the inward teſtimony of the Spirit along with them, that manifeſts them to be genuine and of divine authority. Some indeed there are, who join theſe two arguments together as one, but generally they are made diſtinct; I ſhall therefore conſider,

2. *How far the opinion of our Reformers, and others after them, concerning the teſtimony of the Spirit to the truth of the Scriptures, is to be depended upon.* What their opinion is, may be ſeen from their own words, produced at large above: the ſubſtance is, that we are to have recourſe to ſome ſecret illumination or teſtimony of the Spirit, by which alone we can be convinced rightly, what Scriptures are the word of God. That the influences of the Holy Spirit are neceſſary to produce ſuch a faith in divine things, as ſhall effectually transform the heart, and powerfully incline the ſoul to a due

[a] 2 Theſſ. ii. 2, &c.——iii. 17. See above, p. 24, 25.

obedience

obedience to the Goſpel, can be reaſonably denied by none, who own the account the Scripture has given of his offices to be true. To open our eyes to ſee that evidence of Scripture-verity which is already extant, to remove our blindneſs, and, by farther ſanctifying, to remove our natural enmity to the truth, &c. is a teſtimony of the Spirit, which every good Chriſtian ought to hope and pray for [b]. Some have thought this was all our Reformers meant, among whom is Dr. Calamy, in his excellent Sermons of Inſpiration [c]: but the paſſages above make it evident, as Mr. Baxter obſerves [d], that it is another kind of teſtimony than this, which many great Divines reſolve their faith into; in ſhort, no other than an immediate revelation or inſpiration, like that of the Prophets or Apoſtles. But concerning this I obſerve,

1. That if any are made happy with this argument to convince them, *it can only be an argument to himſelf*, and cannot be made uſe of to convince another; becauſe he may juſtly except either againſt the judgment or veracity of him who pretends to it. *This is only an argument* (ſays Biſhop Burnet [e]) *to him that feels it, if it be one at all.* If therefore we attempt to reconcile a Heathen, Jew, or unbeliever, as all men once were, to the belief of the Scriptures, it muſt be by ſome other arguments.

2. To aſſert, the Scriptures only can be proved by the teſtimony of the Spirit, *is very likely to introduce ſuch enthuſiaſm among Chriſtians, as will infallibly render the Canon of Scripture uncertain and precarious.* For as every perſon is, and muſt be, judge of this teſtimony, it is not ſtrange if men ſhould urge it for other books, which are not commonly received: and if they do ſo, how can theſe Divines anſwer them? Will they ſay, the Spirit never does nor can give his teſtimony, but to books of his own inſpiration, and conſequently not to any but the books of our preſent Canon? This would be plain trifling, becauſe it ſuppoſes the thing, which is to be proved, for granted; it firſt ſuppoſes the books are inſpired,

[b] Saint's Reſt, Par. 2. c. 2. §. 3.
[c] Serm. 2. p. 40.
[d] Ibid.
[e] On Artic. 6. p. 79.

and then proves that they are ſo, becauſe they are ſo. And yet no better anſwer can be given to one, who claims inſpiration for an Apocryphal book, by thoſe who allow no other arguments but the teſtimony of the Spirit. Upon this principle, therefore, men are at their liberty to bring in all the rhapſodies of the antient hereticks, if they pleaſe, and there is no oppoſing them. They pretend the teſtimony of the Spirit for their book, and we can do no more for ours. How uncertain this leaves the Canon, every one muſt ſee: beſides, to uſe the words of the ingenious writer juſt mentioned, *If a perſon ſay, he is aſſured of the inſpiration of the Scriptures now received, by the inſpiration of the ſame Spirit who indited them, it is natural to enquire, what evidence he has, that this inſpiration he pretends to is real, and not imaginary? that it is from the Spirit of God, and not from a Spirit of deluſion? His only anſwer, I ſuppoſe, muſt be this: That he is ſatisfied in the ſame way the ſacred penmen were at firſt, as to their inſpiration. And let this be admitted, and a wide gap is opened to enthuſiaſm, and there is no remedy*[f].

3. I argue againſt this, as the only right method of proving the Canon of Scripture *from matter of fact, or by appeal to the conſciences of all men.* According to this hypotheſis, all men, who believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, muſt have the teſtimony of the Spirit. Now I aſk, whether it be not notorious in fact, that multitudes firmly believe the truth of the Revelation, who are neither conſcious of any inſpiration, nor even deſired it, nor even ſo much as heard of the neceſſity of it? Did the Spirit ever tell them, or do they ſo much as pretend it told them, they ſhould receive one book, and reject another? *For my part* (ſaid Mr. Baxter[g]) *I confeſs, I could never boaſt of any ſuch teſtimony or light of the Spirit, nor reaſon neither, which, without human teſtimony, would have made me believe, that the Book of Canticles is Canonical, and written by Solomon, and the Book of Wiſdom Apocryphal, and written by Philo, &c. Nor could I have known all, or any hiſtorical books, ſuch as Joſhua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chroni-*

[f] Loc. ſup. cit.

[g] Pref. to Part 2. of Saint's Reſt, §. 6.

cles,

cles, Ezra, Nehemiah, &c. to be written by divine inſpiration, but by tradition, &c. He ſpeaks, without doubt, the common ſentiments of moſt Chriſtians; and if the matter of fact be thus, there can be no poſſible method of anſwering the argument, but by ſaying, the greateſt part of them who profeſs to believe, do not believe the Scriptures, and that the unregenerate cannot believe them to be the Word of God; which though ſome, through a too great fondneſs for their opinion, have ventured to aſſert, is ſo very rude and groundleſs a charge, that it deſerves no anſwer. I conclude this head with the words of a late writer above-cited [h]; *I cannot ſee, how any immediate revelation of the Spirit ſhould be neceſſary to a rational conviction in this caſe; or how we can ſuppoſe the Divine Spirit ſhould whiſper it in the ear of every man, that is ſatisfied upon this head, that this Book we call the Bible, is of divine inſpiration.* Thus I have endeavoured to make way for, and indeed I hope in a great meaſure eſtabliſhed, my firſt Propoſition, That tradition, or the teſtimony of the antients, is the principal method of determining the Canon; a more direct proof of which ſhall be the work of the following chapter.

CHAP. VII.

That the beſt Method, by which the Canonical Authority of any Book or Books can be eſtabliſhed, is by the Teſtimonies of thoſe, who lived neareſt to the Times in which they were written.

HAVING in the preceding chapter largely ſhewn, that neither, 1. The authority of the Church; nor, 2. The innate evidences of the Scripture, with the teſtimony of the Spirit, are the means by which we can eſtabliſh the Canon of Scripture, I come now to ſhew,

III. *That the principal means, whereby we can know whether any books be Canonical, is by tradition, or the well-approved*

[h] Dr. Calamy, at the place above-cited.

teſtimonies of thoſe, who lived in or near the time of their being firſt written.

The queſtion concerning the Canon of the New Teſtament, is plainly a queſtion concerning certain matters of fact, that were about 1700 years ago, viz. *Whether ſuch and ſuch books were written by the perſons under whoſe names they go.* Whether they were inſpired, or no, is not the buſineſs here to enquire; but, *Whether ſuch perſons wrote ſuch and ſuch books.* If then the queſtion be about a plain fact, it is evident, the way to decide it muſt be by the teſtimony of ſome, who either themſelves knew the certain truth of the fact, or elſe received it from others who did ſo. Thus, and thus only, we know, there was ſuch a perſon as Julius Cæſar, who did ſuch and ſuch things; thus we know that Ovid, Virgil, or Livy, wrote the books under their names, &c. and thus we know, the Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt wrote the books which go under their names. And ſince (as has been above proved, Prop. II. Coroll. 2.) the witneſſes to be produced, viz. the firſt Chriſtians, are good and capable witneſſes, or judges, of the fact; it is evident, the principal method of knowing which is a truly Canonical book, is to ſearch into the moſt antient and authentic records of the Chriſtian Church, which was the thing to be proved. This was the method the firſt Chriſtians conſtantly made uſe of, to prove againſt the hereticks the truth of the ſacred books, viz. *by appealing to that certain and undoubted tradition, which aſſured them they were the writings of the perſons whoſe names they bear.* Irenæus[i], Tertullian[k], Euſebius[l], Cyril[m], Auſtin[n], and others, have frequently made uſe of this argument to very good purpoſe. But there is no need of producing authorities; the matter is clear. A fact muſt be proved by the teſtimony either of thoſe who knew it, or of thoſe who received it by good and credible tradition from them. I would have the contrary minded (as a noted Writer well argues[o]), tell me "How they know, without human teſti-

[i] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 1, 2.
[k] Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5. Vid. Pamel. ad loc.
[l] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3. et 25.
[m] Catech. IV. §. 33. et §. 36.
[n] Contr. Fauſt. Manich. l. 11. c. 2. et l. 22. c. 79. et l. 33. c. 6.
[o] Pref. to Saint's Reſt, Part 2. §. 6.

"mony

" mony or tradition, that theſe are the ſame books, which the " Prophets and Apoſtles wrote? and wholly the ſame? that " they are not depraved, and wilfully corrupted? that theſe " are all? How know you that one of the books of Eſther " is Canonical, and the other Apocryphal? Where is the " man that ever knew the Canon from the Apocrypha, before " it was told him?" &c. I might argue yet farther, and aſk, How, but by tradition, do moſt men believe the Scriptures to be truly tranſlated out of their originals? For, not underſtanding them themſelves, they are liable to be impoſed upon, and neceſſitated to credit the fidelity of thoſe, who do underſtand them. If they do not believe the teſtimony and faithfulneſs of the tranſlators, it is impoſſible any internal evidence ſhould convince them of the truth of the books tranſlated. But to omit this, it is indeed very obſervable, that the ſame writers, who at ſome times have wrote warmly for the teſtimony of the Spirit, have at other times, forgetting this, given up the whole of the controverſy, by allowing all to the Church and tradition. Nothing leſs than this is certainly implied in that conceſſion of Dr. Whitaker[p], *That the Church has power, or it belongs to its office, to judge or determine, what are true, genuine, and Canonical books; and what are falſe, ſpurious, and Apocryphal.* And I cannot but obſerve, that Calvin himſelf, though in the paſſages above-cited, he ſays, *Men cannot by any arguments be brought to believe the Scriptures*; yet, in the next chapter[q], does himſelf make uſe of *many arguments taken from teſtimony and tradition* for this purpoſe; ſuch as, *The providence of God in preſerving them under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Septuagint tranſlation, &c. for the Old Teſtament: the wonderful ſucceſs of Chriſtianity againſt all oppoſition, the mighty prevalence of its doctrines, the death of martyrs*, &c. all which are founded only upon hiſtory and tradition. Others who, unwilling to diſpute the ſufficiency of the argument from internal evidences, have attempted a ſort of medium, or compounding the matter, by a ſtrange ſort of mixture

[p] Controverſ. de Scriptur. I. Quæſt. III. c. 2. juxt. fin.

[q] Inſtit. Chriſt. Relig. l. 1. c. 8. §. 10.

of both. Thus Dr. Coſin [r], allowing the force of internal teſtimonies to prove the Scriptures, ſays, that "notwithſtanding this, for the particular number of ſuch books, whether "they be more or leſs, we have no better nor other external "teſtimony, or rule herein to guide us, than the conſtant "voice of the Catholic Church, as it hath been delivered to "us upon record from one generation to another." To me (though I freely own, and thank God, I am able to ſee an excellency in the Scriptures far beyond all other books, and truſt to feel more of the efficacy daily upon my own heart, by the Spirit of God) nothing ſeems more unreaſonable than this ſort of compoſition. It is in other words no more than this: The internal evidences of the Scriptures convince us in general they are divine, but not in particular; they convince us all the books are, but not ſuch and ſuch particular ones; which, I think, is a direct contradiction. Placæus is ſomewhat more conſiſtent with himſelf; though, I believe, his compounding notion will hardly be approved [s]; viz. "That "the truly Canonical books have more or fewer, greater or "ſmaller, characters and evidences of their divinity, as they "are more or leſs neceſſary to the Church; and on the con-"trary, Apocryphal books, as they are more or leſs unfit for "the Canon, have more or fewer, greater or leſs evidences "of human compoſure: ſo that (ſays he) there may be ſome "Canonical books, ſuch, for inſtance, as the Book of Eſther, "which we ſhall hardly be able to prove Canonical; and "ſome Apocryphal pieces, ſuch as the Prayer of Manaſſes [t], "which we ſhall hardly be able to prove Apocryphal, by any "other arguments, than ſuch as are drawn from the language "in which they are written, and the conſtant teſtimony of "the antient Church." The plain meaning of which is, That ſome books prove themſelves to be of divine original, others do not; the Spirit dictated ſome books, which evidence they are his, others which do not. Every one can ſee, how contrary this is to the Reformers' doctrine; and I am unwilling to

[r] Scholaſt. Hiſt. of the Canon, §. 8.

[s] Differt. de Canon. §. 24. inter Theſſ. Salmur.

[t] It is extant among the Apocrypha of the Old Teſtament.

make

make any other inference; only would hence obſerve, what abſurdities the greateſt men run into, who do not allow themſelves a juſt freedom of thought.

Upon the whole, then, the ſubſtance of what I contend for is; The ſacred books of the New Teſtament at their firſt writing, were publiſhed abroad in the world, and delivered to the firſt Churches, in diſtant countries, for their uſe: they who firſt received them, knew them to be the books of the perſons under whoſe names they were publiſhed, and could and did teſtify to the ſucceeding ages, what they thus knew of theſe facts. This teſtimony of the primitive Churches is ſtill faithfully preſerved in the writings of the antient Chriſtians, and is therefore not only a good and ſufficient, but the principal means, by which we know the truth of the fact, viz. that the books were written by ſuch and ſuch men. Beſide this, the books themſelves contain in themſelves evidences of their excellency above all others; which ſhould be the means to ſtrengthen and confirm our faith: and for our farther help, we are to hope for the influences of God's Holy Spirit, to clear our judgments, and free us from thoſe prejudices, which we naturally have againſt divine things; to help us to ſee the former evidences in their due ſtrength, and ſo to impreſs the things revealed on our minds, as to produce a ſuitable conduct and behaviour.

There is only one objection, as far as I can ſee, left, which deſerves any conſideration; and that is, If it is by tradition, and ſearching the records of the antients, that we are to have ſatisfaction as to the truth of the Scriptures, then *the greater part of Chriſtians, who are not capable of doing this, muſt be without ſatisfaction.*

To which I anſwer, That though the bulk of Chriſtians cannot themſelves have recourſe to theſe original evidences; yet there are many, who have with a great deal of diligence and impartiality made it their buſineſs to do it, whoſe teſtimonies they have, and may ſafely depend upon, as they neither can nor would deceive in a matter of ſuch importance. Nor does it follow from hence, that their faith is ill grounded, becauſe it relies on the teſtimony of fallible men, and ſo is

but

but a human faith; for this is no more than what equally follows from their not knowing the original languages, and ſo being in conſequence obliged to depend upon the veracity and judgment of others, for the truth and goodneſs of it[u].

If any, after all, oppoſe their own experience to what I above ſaid; I deſire them to conſider, 1. That this can be no argument to prove the Scriptures to another; and, 2. Whether the utmoſt he can infer from his experience with reaſon be not this, That he has felt the powerful influences of the Chriſtian Religion, revealed in the New Teſtament, upon his heart, without having ever been made to know, at any particular time, that ſuch books and ſuch paſſages were of divine original, or to diſtinguiſh what is genuine in them, from what is ſpurious[x]?

CHAP. VIII.

A large Account of all the Places in the Chriſtian Writers of the four firſt Centuries, where Catalogues are to be found of the Books of the New Teſtament.

PROP. IV.

Thoſe Books, which are mentioned in the Catalogues made by the moſt antient Chriſtian Writers, of the ſacred and inſpired Books, are to be eſteemed Canonical; and thoſe which are not found in any of theſe Catalogues, muſt be eſteemed Apocryphal.

THIS Propoſition does neceſſarily depend upon, and follow from the foregoing one; for if the tradition or teſtimony of the moſt early writers of Chriſtianity be, as was there proved, the method, by which we are to determine concerning the authority of any book, their evidence

[u] Saint's Reſt, Part 2. c. 4. §. 6.

[x] They are Biſhop Burnet's words on Art. 6. p. 79. He who would ſee more of the neceſſity and nature of the tradition, that eſtabliſhes the Canon of the New Teſtament, may read Mr. Dodwell's Diſſert. in Iren. 1. §. 35, 36, 37.

can

can never be more clear or material, than when they purpoſely give us liſts or catalogues of thoſe books, which are to be received as ſacred and Canonical. All theſe catalogues I have with much labour endeavoured to collect, and ſhall preſently produce; premiſing only, that the omiſſion of a book in ſome one or two particular catalogues, cannot with any reaſon be urged againſt its Canonical authority, if it be found in all, or moſt of the others; and any good reaſons can be aſſigned for the omiſſion where it is. Thus, for inſtance, the Revelation is omitted, either becauſe it was not perhaps known to the author, or its credit not ſufficiently eſtabliſhed in the country where he lived; or, which perhaps may be as probable as the other, becauſe it being ſo full of myſteries, few or none were judged proper or able to read it to any purpoſe. This was certainly the caſe in England; this book being, for this reaſon, omitted in the public Calendar for reading the Scriptures, though it be received into the Canon. If therefore theſe, or any ſuch good reaſons can be aſſigned for the omiſſion of a book in a particular catalogue (as, I hope, will appear in the particular examination of the books), it will be very unfair to infer, from my Propoſition, that ſuch book is Apocryphal, eſpecially when it is to be found in many, or moſt other catalogues. This premiſed, I ſhall now produce the catalogues themſelves, not at length, which would be a needleſs tranſcribing the ſame things many times over; but only citing the ſeveral places in the authors where they are, and noting the leaſt difference from our preſent Canon, and withal adding the year of their writing.

A LIST of all thoſe Places in the Chriſtian Writers of the four firſt Centuries, in which are to be found Catalogues of the Books of the New Teſtament.

N. B. In moſt of theſe places the Reader may alſo ſee Catalogues of the Books of the Old Teſtament; and, for the benefit of thoſe, who may deſire to know which thoſe Places are, I have marked them thus *.

The Names of the Writers.	The Times in which they lived.	The Variation or Agreement of their Catalogues with ours now received.	The Places of their Writings, in which theſe Catalogues are.
I.	*A. C.*		
* ORIGEN, a Preſbyter of Alexandria, who employed incredible pains in knowing the Scriptures.	210.	Omits the Epiſtles of James and Jude, though he owns them both in other parts of his writings.	*Comment. in Matth. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 6. *c.* 25. *Expoſit. in Joan. l.* 5. *apud Euſeb. ibid.*
II.			
EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS, whoſe writings evidence his zeal about the Sacred Writings, and his great care to be informed, which were genuine, and which not.	315.	His Catalogue is exactly the ſame with the modern one; only he ſays, the Epiſtles of James, Jude, the 2d of Peter, the 2d and 3d of John, though they were generally received, yet had been by ſome doubted of. As to the Revelation, though he ſays ſome rejected it, yet he ſays others received it; and himſelf places it among thoſe, which are to be received without diſpute.	*Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 25. *confer ejuſdem lib. c.* 3.

The Names of the Writers.	The times in which they lived.	The Variation or Agreement of their Catalogues with ours now received.	The Places of their Writings, in which theſe Catalogues are.
III.	*A. C.*		
* ATHANASIUS, Bp. of Alexandria.	315.	The ſame perfectly with ours now received.	*Fragment. Epiſt. Feſtal. et in Synopſ. Scriptur. Sacr.*
IV.			
* CYRIL, Bp. of Jeruſalem.	340.	The ſame with ours, only the Revelation is omitted.	*Catech.* IV. §. 36.
V.			
* The Biſhops aſſembled in the Council of Laodicea.	364. †	The Revelation is omitted.	*Canon.* LX. *N. B.* The Canons of this Council were not long afterwards received into the body of the Canons of the univerſal Church.
VI.			
EPIPHANIUS, Bp. of Salamis in Cyprus.	370.	The ſame with ours now received.	*Hæreſ.* 76. *c.* 5.
VII.			
GREGORY NAZIANZEN, Bp. of Conſtantinople.	375.	Omits the Revelation.	*Carm. de veris et genuin. Scriptur.*
VIII.			
PHILASTRIUS, Bp. of Brixia in Venice.	380.	The ſame with ours now received; except that he mentions only thirteen of St. Paul's Epiſtles (omitting, very probably, the Epiſtle to the Hebrews), and leaves out the Revelation.	*Lib. de Hæreſ.* 87.

† The Papiſts generally place this Council before the Council of Nice.

The Names of the Writers.	The Times in which they lived.	The Variation or Agreement of their Catalogues with ours now received.	The Places of their Writings, in which these Catalogues are.
IX.	*A. C.*		
* JEROME.	382.	The same with ours; except that he speaks dubiously of the Epist. to the Hebrews; though in other parts of his writings he receives it as Canonical; as hereafter will appear.	*Ep. ad Paulin. de stud. Script.* Also commonly prefixed to the *Latin Vulgate.*
			Expos. in Symb. Apostol. §. 36. *int. Op. Hieron. et inter Op. Cypr.*
X.			
* RUFFIN, Presbyter of Aquilegium.	390.	It perfectly agrees with ours.	
XI.			
* AUSTIN, Bp. of Hippo in Africa.	394.	It perfectly agrees with ours.	*De Doct. Christ. l.* 2. *c.* 8.
XII.			
* The XLIV Bps. assembled in the third Council of Carthage.	St. Austin was present at it.	It perfectly agrees with ours.	*Vid. Canon.* XLVII. *et cap. ult.*
XIII.			
The anonymous author of the works under the name of DIONYSIUS the Areopagite.	390.	It seems perfectly to agree with ours: for though he doth not, for good reasons, produce the names of the books; yet (as the learned Daillé says, *De Script. suppos. Dionys. l.* 1. *c.* 16.) he so clearly describes them, as that he has left out no divine book, may be easily perceived.	*Lib. de Hierarch. Eccl. c.* 3.

Theſe are the principal catalogues of the books of the New Teſtament, that are to be found before the fifth century. Some perhaps have eſcaped my knowledge; and ſome, pretending to this age, I have purpoſely omitted: as that in the Conſtitutions under the Apoſtles' names, and that in the 85th Canon, under the ſaid name [y]; taking it here for granted, that they are not only ſpurious, but of uncertain original; and that attributed by Pappus, in his Synodicon, to the Council of Nice[z], with this relation, That the Biſhops there aſſembled were, by a very extraordinary miracle, convinced which were inſpired, and which were Apocryphal books, after this manner: *Having put all the books, that laid claim to inſpiration, under the communion-table in a Church, they prayed to God, that thoſe which were of Divine inſpiration might be found above, or upon, the table, thoſe which were Apocryphal might be found under; and accordingly, as they prayed, it came to paſs.* Such accounts are not only very falſe and fabulous, but plainly ridiculous and incredible.

CHAP. IX.

How we are to judge of the Canonical Authority of any Book, by its being cited by any Chriſtian Writers.

PROP. V.

Thoſe Books are juſtly eſteemed Canonical, which the firſt Writers of Chriſtianity have cited in their Writings as Scripture; and thoſe Apocryphal, which they have not.

THE truth of each part of the Propoſition neceſſarily follows from Prop. III. For if we are to receive what they received as Canonical, we are infallibly ſure of this, by

[y] Conſtit. Apoſt. c. 57.

[z] Ἐν γὰρ τῷ οἴκῳ τῷ Θεῷ κάτω παρὰ τῇ θείᾳ τραπέζῃ αὐτὰς παραθεμένη προσηύξατο, ὡς εὑρεθῆναι τὰς θεοπνεύστους ἐπάνω, τὸν Κύριον ἐξαιτησαμένη, καὶ τὰς ἀποδήλους, ὃ καὶ γέγονεν, ὑποκάτωθεν. Syn. 34.

obſerving

obſerving *what books they cited as Scripture in their Works, and what they did not.* An univerſal agreement of writers in the moſt remote countries, in quoting the ſame books as Scripture, and no other as ſuch, is, if the fact be true, a very plain and demonſtrative indication of the true Canon. It is not at all neceſſary I ſhould here go about to prove the fact, viz. that the writers of the firſt four Centuries have cited ſuch and ſuch books, and univerſally omitted others; this I hope to make good hereafter. All that I contend for now is, that if they have done ſo, it is a proof to us, that the books cited are Canonical, and the books not cited are Apocryphal; and that will appear thus: Their univerſal agreement to cite ſome books, and omit others, muſt neceſſarily proceed from one of theſe two cauſes, viz. either,

1. *Becauſe they had not yet ſeen or known any other books claiming Divine authority, beſides thoſe which they did cite*; or,

2. *Becauſe if they did know them, they did not eſteem them of equal authority with thoſe which they did cite.*

Beſides theſe, I cannot conceive any other reaſon aſſignable. Now if the laſt be aſſigned, the matter is given up, and the Propoſition at once eſtabliſhed; for what the antients looked upon as Canonical and Apocryphal, we are (by Prop. III.) to judge ſo too. If the firſt be ſaid, viz. *That theſe books are cited, and no other, becauſe theſe had the good fortune to be known, and the others had not*; this will be no leſs giving up the cauſe; for their not being known, is to us (by Prop. III.) the ſame as not being Canonical; inaſmuch as this their obſcurity proceeded from their wanting that public teſtimony of their being wrote by the Apoſtles, which the other books had given them by the Churches. The Propoſition therefore holds good; and I cannot but think it worth obſerving, that Euſebius (to whom, above all beſides, we are indebted for our helps to eſtabliſh the Canon) makes frequent uſe of the very ſame Propoſition, to diſtinguiſh between thoſe books which are, or are not to be received. So, for inſtance, he proves the firſt Epiſtle of Peter to be genuine, *becauſe the moſt antient writers of Chriſtianity before his time made continual uſe of it in their writings, as an undoubted*

doubted book [a]; and a little afterwards [b], proves the Acts of Peter, the Goſpel, the Preaching, and the Revelation of Peter, to be Apocryphal, *becauſe none of the writers of the Chriſtian Church have in their writings taken any teſtimonies out of theſe books.* And elſewhere [c], having mentioned ſeveral ſpurious books under the Apoſtles' names, ſuch as the Goſpels of Peter, Thomas, Matthias, the Acts of Andrew and John, and others, he rejects them, becauſe *no Eccleſiaſtical writer hath made any uſe of them in his writings.*

This argument does ſo directly prove and eſtabliſh our preſent Canon, that thoſe who attempt to weaken the Canon, have always made it their main work to ſhew, that *the firſt writers were wont indifferently or promiſcuouſly to quote the Scriptures we now receive, and others, in their works.* So Mr. Dodwell in the famous paſſage above cited [d]; and Mr. Toland in his Amyntor has done little elſe but paraphraſed upon this thought, which he borrowed from Mr. Dodwell. I am ſorry to ſay, that ſeveral learned men have too unguardedly dropped expreſſions of the like nature; as has been obſerved in the beginning of the Diſſertation prefixed to this volume. In anſwer to this opinion of Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Toland, ſeveral things have been well urged by Mr. Nye [e], and after him by Mr. Richardſon [f]: but it appears to me impoſſible to give a due anſwer to it any other way, than by a particular ſurvey of all the places in the Fathers, where they are ſuppoſed to have quoted any other books as Scripture, beſide thoſe now received; which is propoſed as the work of the ſecond part of this volume. In the mean time, for the better explaining and eſtabliſhing my Propoſition, I muſt obſerve three or four things.

[a] Οἱ παλαι Πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηνται συγγράμμασι. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.

[b] Ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων, μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς, ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις. Ibid.

[c] Ὧν οὐδεὶς ὐδαμοῦ ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνὴρ εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἠξίωσεν. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.

[d] Diſſert. 1. in Iren. §. 38, 39.

[e] Defence of the Canon, p. 57, &c.

[f] Canon Vindicated, p. 23, &c. and 73, &c.

1. *That the Propoſition does not mean a bare citing of a book, but citing it as Scripture.* St. Paul has cited Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides; the firſt Chriſtian writers have cited a thouſand heathen authors, which, I hope, no one would have made part of the Canon.

2. That the Propoſition *does not determine the authority of any book or books, upon the credit of any one or two particular writers, but the whole body of the writers of the primitive Church:* and therefore if one or two particular perſons ſhould appear to be impoſed upon, either in rejecting or receiving any book, we are not from their ſingle teſtimony to argue againſt the book; eſpecially,

3. If it appear from other parts of their writings, by the moſt undoubted evidence, that *they did not receive the book they ſeem to receive, or reject the book they ſeem to reject, in this particular place.*

CHAP. X.

Concerning the Reading of the Sacred Books in the Primitive Churches, as a Proof of their Canonical Authority.

PROP. VI.

Thoſe Books are Canonical, which the Primitive Chriſtians read in their Churches, or publick Aſſemblies, as the Scriptures, or Word of God.

THE evidence of this Propoſition is the ſame as of the two foregoing, from Prop. III. As it was the conſtant practice of the Jewiſh Church in their ſynagogues, ſo it was of the Chriſtians in their religious meetings, to read the ſacred Scriptures. This practice is clearly proved from Col. iv. 16. where St. Paul mentions the reading publickly in the Church of the Coloſſians and Laodiceans, his Epiſtle to the former, as alſo an Epiſtle from the latter in the Church of the former.

This

This we find in the beginning of the second century, from Justin Martyr [g]. *On the day*, says he, *which is called Sunday, there is a meeting of all* [the Christians] *who live either in cities or country places, and the memoirs of the Apostles, and writings of the Prophets are read.* So Tertullian, giving an account of the Christians' meetings, says, [h] *They assembled to read the Scriptures, and to offer up prayers.* And in another place [i], *among the solemn exercises of the Lord's day, he reckons reading the Scriptures, singing Psalms, &c.* The same account we have in Cyprian [k], the antient book under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite [l], and several other antient writers, cited by Pamelius in his learned notes on Tertullian's Apology [m]. Now, I say, these books are to be received by us as Canonical, forasmuch as this practice of reading the Scriptures was so very early, that it is hardly possible to suppose the Churches imposed upon by any spurious or forged pieces. Hence Cyril of Jerusalem, instructing his Catechumen concerning the Scriptures, tells him [n], *to avoid Apocryphal books, and study carefully those Scriptures only, which were publickly read in the Church*; and a little after, having given him a catalogue of the sacred books, he adds, *let all others be rejected; and such as are not read in the Churches, neither do you read in private.* Hence, in the middle of the fourth century, it was decreed by the Council of Laodicea, in their fifty-ninth Canon, that *no private psalms should be read in the Church, nor any books without the*

[g] Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρὸς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν, ἀναγινώσκεται. Apol. 2. p. 98.

[h] Coginur ad divinarum literarum commemorationem. Apol. adv. gent. c. 39.

[i] Inter Dominica solennia—Scripturæ leguntur, aut Psalmi canuntur, aut allocutiones proferuntur, aut petitiones delegantur. De Anima, c. 9.

[k] Cypr. Epist. 38, 39.

[l] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 3. juxt. init.

[m] Scil. in Apolog. c. 39.

[n] Πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μηδὲν ἔχε κοινὸν· ταύτας μόνας μελέτα σπουδαίως, ἃς καὶ ἐν Ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ παῤῥησίας ἀναγινώσκομεν —— τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ, καὶ ὅσα μὲν ἐν Ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται, τοῦτα μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγίνωσκε. Catech. IV. §. 35, 36.

Canon, but only the Canonical ones of the Old and New Teſtament.

But notwithſtanding this and the ſubſequent decree of the third Council of Carthage, Canon XLVII. it is certain ſome other pieces were read in the Churches, both as of the Old and New Teſtament, beſide thoſe which we now receive, long before they were made, as well as about that time. Thus, for inſtance, among the books of the New, Dionyſius, a biſhop of Corinth in the ſecond century, in a letter to the Church of Rome [o], tells them, *they read on the Lord's Day Clement's Epiſtle to them in their aſſemblies*; and Euſebius [p] declares it to have been *univerſally received, and read in moſt Churches*, both in his and former times. The ſame he ſays of the *Shepherd of Hermas* [q], that *it was read in many Churches*; which is confirmed by Athanaſius [r] and Ruffinus [s] both concerning this and ſome other books.

Beſides, the book of the Revelation was not read in the Churches, according to Cyril; nor commanded to be read by the Council of Laodicea: and ſo it may be objected, that if the Propoſition we are diſcuſſing be true, as the former books which were read (ſuch as Clemens, Hermas, &c.) ſhould be received by us into the Canon, as they are by Mr. Whiſton; ſo the Revelation ſhould be left out. But, as was ſaid on a like account (Prop. ult.), the full anſwer to this cannot be till the books are particularly examined; nevertheleſs, I would obſerve,

Firſt, *That the Propoſition ſpeaks only of books that were read in Churches as Scripture; and that there is a vaſt difference between being read in a Church, and being of divine inſpiration.* For it is certain, there were many books read, which were not looked upon as infallible and Canonical Scripture, but only as pious and uſeful books, which might be of ſervice to the common people. Theſe books, in contradiſtinction to the other, they were wont to call Eccleſiaſtical. *There are other books,*

[o] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 16.
[p] Id. l. 4. c. 23.
[q] Id. l. 3. c. 3.
[r] Epiſt. Paſchal.
[s] Expoſit. in Symbol. Apoſtol. §. 36.

ſays

ſays Ruffin[t], *which are not called by our anceſtors Canonical, but Eccleſiaſtical*, among which he reckons the Wiſdom of Solomon, and the Wiſdom of the Son of Sirach (which on this very account had its title of Eccleſiaſticus), Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Judgment of Peter. Accordingly Jerome[u], ſpeaking of the books of Tobit, Judith, &c. *The Church reads them*, ſays he, *but does not receive them as Canonical Scripture——it reads them for the edification of the common people, not as having any authority to determine articles of faith.* Juſt of the ſame value were theſe books among the antients, as the Apocrypha of the Old Teſtament in the Church of England, and the Homilies appointed to be read in the Churches are now; and therefore the bare reading them in the primitive aſſemblies, cannot be in itſelf a proof of their Canonical authority, unleſs they were read as Scripture.

From this obſervation we may, I think, give a very eaſy and natural account, how it came to paſs, that any books were of dubious authority among the antients; viz. being firſt read in the publick aſſemblies at the ſame time as the ſacred Scriptures, but only as pious and uſeful books; thoſe who in after ages were ignorant of this reaſon, began to queſtion whether they were not of the ſame authority with the ſacred books themſelves; and ſo from hence aroſe that noted diſtinction in Euſebius[x], of thoſe which were,

1. Ὁμολογούμενοι, i. e. ſuch as were univerſally received without any controverſy.

2. Ἀντιλεγόμενοι, i. e. ſuch whoſe authority was doubted of by ſome.

3. Νόθοι, i. e. ſuch which were rejected by all but hereticks.

The ſame diſtinction we find in Cyril[y], into thoſe which were,

1. Παρὰ πᾶσιν Ὁμολογούμενα, i. e. ſuch as all owned. And,

2. Τὰ Ἀμφιβαλλόμενα, i. e. ſuch as were doubted of.

[t] Expoſit. in Symbol. Apoſtol. §. 36.

[u] Præfat. in Libr. Solom.

[x] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3. et 25.

[y] Catech. IV. §. 33.

In like manner St. Auſtin[z] ſpeaks of thoſe, which were received by all Catholick Churches, and thoſe which were rejected by ſome few Churches; he muſt needs mean of hereticks, becauſe they are oppoſed to the Catholicks. I own, indeed, the inſtances Euſebius produces of his ſecond ſort, were not doubted of by the reaſon now aſſigned; but whatever doubtful books the others meant, may be well included in our account, ſeeing they ſpeak not of any of the books of the preſent Canon being doubted of, as he does.

Secondly, I obſerve, that though Euſebius and Ruffin mention ſome books as read in the Churches, yet *themſelves do expreſsly exclude them from the Canon*; as Euſebius does the Shepherd of Hermas, placing it among the ſpurious books[a]; and Ruffin in ſo many words tells us, *it was not reputed Canonical*[b].

As to the Revelation being omitted in Cyril's catalogue, and in the eighty-fifth Canon of the Council of Laodicea, as not being read in the Churches; I ſhall refer the reader to the reaſons above aſſigned for its being left out of ſome catalogues, and to the particular enquiry into this book hereafter.

CHAP. XI.

Several Propoſitions, whereby we may diſtinguiſh the Spuriouſneſs of many Books.

PROP. VII.

That Book is certainly Apocryphal, in which are found any Contradictions.

THE truth of this is evident: for as both ſides of a contradictory Propoſition cannot be true, ſuch book muſt neceſſarily

[z] De Doct. Chriſt. l. 2. c. 8.
[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.
[b] Expoſit. in Symbol. Apoſtol. §. 36.

cessarily contain somewhat that is false, and consequently cannot have God for its author, nor be to us a rule of doctrine and manners.

PROP. VIII.

That Book is Apocryphal, which either contains any Histories, or proposes any Doctrines, contrary to those which are certainly known to be true.

THIS is evident for the same reason as the former; to impute such a book to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, being, in other words, to make God the author of a lie, and to take him for our guide in matters of the last consequence, whom we know to be not only fallible, but actually deceived.

Coroll. That therefore is an Apocryphal book, which contains any thing contrary to the known facts, or universally agreed doctrines of the Christian Religion. I hope it will not be thought a defect in strict reasoning, that I take it for granted, that the substance of Christianity is true; for this cannot be denied by any who will believe any matter of fact, of which they have not themselves been eye-witnesses. But if any will dispute this, and say, I take for granted what I ought not, having not proved it; I refer them to what is said, Coroll. 2. Prop. II. where, I think, as much is proved, at least is fairly implied, as I here take for granted.

I purposely omit here all instances, reserving them for their proper places; only would observe, that Eusebius [c] makes use of the same Proposition to disprove the Canonical authority of many books, that went under the Apostles' names. *The sentiments*, says he, *and doctrines, which are delivered in those books, are so very different from, or contrary to, the true and orthodox doctrine of the Church, as evidently demonstrate them to*

[c] Ἥ τε γνώμη καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς φερομένων προαίρεσις, πλεῖστον ὅσον τῆς ἀληθοῦς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀπᾴδουσα, ὅτι δὴ αἱρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν [illegible] τυγχάνει, σαφῶς παρίστησιν· ὅθεν οὐδ' ἐν νόθοις αὐτὰ κατατακτέον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄτοπα πάντη καὶ δυσσεβῆ παραιτητέον. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.

be the forgeries of hereticks, and therefore not only to be ranked among ſpurious pieces, but to be utterly rejected as abſurd and impious. Thus alſo Serapio, Tertullian, Epiphanius, and many others, reject the particular Apocryphal pieces they have occaſion in their writings to mention; and thus, by the way, *we may prove all, or moſt of thoſe books, which are called the Apocrypha of the Old Teſtament, to be really ſuch.*

PROP. IX.

That Book is Apocryphal, in which are contained Things ludicrous or trifling; fabulous or ſilly Relations.

THIS will admit no diſpute among thoſe, who believe God to be a Being of infinite wiſdom and knowledge. For him to give us ſuch books, would argue him guilty either of weakneſs and folly, or of impoſing upon his creatures a neceſſity of believing things contrary to their moſt improved reaſon.

Beſides that it can not be ſuppoſed, that even men of honeſty and wiſdom would be the authors of ſuch ſort of books: for either themſelves believed what they wrote, or they did not; if they did not, they are notorious impoſtors, and conſequently not fit to be infallible guides in matters of ſuch conſequence as our everlaſting ſtates; if they did, they were evidently perſons of ſuch ſhallow capacities, and fooliſh credulity, as to deſerve rather to be pitied, than made our directors in the moſt important concerns of this and the next life. Whichever way, therefore, we take it, their writings muſt be Apocryphal. This obſervation is not only evidently true, but of the greateſt neceſſity in the buſineſs we are now about; for it is certain, that a very great number of the Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament are filled with the moſt idle and trifling ſtories, the moſt ridiculous and extravagant fooleries imaginable. The romantick accounts of the Virgin Mary's Nativity, *being bred by Angels, and fed by them in her infancy, &c.* the childiſh relations *of our Saviour's infancy and education, his learning the alphabet, his ſtature, appearing ſometimes as a child, ſometimes as a man, ſometimes ſo tall that his head would reach the clouds,* the

the length of his hair, beard, &c. *the ſpirit's taking him up to Mount Thabor, by one of his hairs,* &c. the ſilly miracles attributed to the Apoſtles, with all the ridiculous circumſtances that attended their ſeveral martyrdoms, &c. are each, with all other ſtories like them, unqueſtionable arguments to prove the books which contain them Apocryphal; and to be no other, than either the works of the weakeſt of men, who were fondly credulous of every report, and had not diſcretion enough to diſtinguiſh between ſenſe and nonſenſe, between that which was credible, and that which was not ſo; or elſe the artful contrivance of ſome, who were more zealous than honeſt, who thought by theſe ſtrange ſtories to gain credit to their new religion.

PROP. X.

That Book is Apocryphal, in which there are any Sort of Things mentioned, which were later than the Time in which the Author, whoſe Name it bears, lived.

I NEED ſpend no time in the proof of this Propoſition; it being impoſſible for any perſon to relate hiſtories, or treat concerning cuſtoms, which were not till long after his time; unleſs we ſuppoſe them either endued with a very extraordinary ſpirit of prophecy, that they could foreknow all the things, perſons, and cuſtoms, that would ariſe in the world after their death; or elſe, that they wrote their books from the other world, and conveyed them by Angels to this world, which, I confeſs, ſome have ſuppoſed to be fact, as to the Letters ſent by Elijah, after he was dead, to Jehoram; mentioned 2 Chron. xxi. 12. And particularly the learned Jeſuit Eſtius ſuppoſes not only the matter to be thus, but demonſtrates from hence the care the Saints have of our affairs, after they are removed from us to the other world[d]. But, I hope, I need not guard againſt ſuch abſurdities; and therefore ſhall take no more pains to prove the Propoſition, but only elucidate it in a few inſtances; in which I ſhall not con-

[d] Annot. in loc. difficil. Script. in 2 Chron. xxi. 12.

fine

fine myſelf to the Apocryphal pieces of the New Teſtament, but make uſe of any other that occur.

1. Some books mention facts, that happened a long while after the pretended author's death. Thus, for inſtance[e], the *Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles* do the controverſy about the Rebaptization of Hereticks, which aroſe not till the third century.

2. Some mention perſons, that did not live till a long time after the pretended author's death. So the book under the name of Hegeſippus, concerning the Deſtruction of Jeruſalem, mentions Conſtantine and Conſtantinople; whereas this could not be before the fourth century, and Hegeſippus lived in the ſecond. And the *Queſtions and Anſwers* under Juſtin Martyr's name mention Irenæus and Origen[f], who both lived after his time.

3. Rites and ceremonies about Baptiſm, Penance, Faſting, Celibacy, Exorciſm, &c. are in the pretended *Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles*; which, it is certain, were not known in their time, nor till long afterwards.

4. Other books are full of words and phraſes, not known till long after their ſuppoſed author's days. Thus the words Clergy, Laity, Readers, Subdeacons, &c. in the *Canons of the Apoſtles*, and other pieces called Apoſtolical. With the new opinions and controverſies of later ages, it was impoſſible but many new words ſhould be coined, which becoming very common, often betray the ſpurioufneſs or forgery of a book.

[e] Lib. 6, c. 15. [f] Vid. Quæſt. 82, 86. & 115.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

The Style of a Book a proper Method to judge of it: A Catalogue of the various Sorts of Styles.

PROP. XI.

That Book is Spurious and Apocryphal, the Style of which is different from, or contrary to, the Style of the Author whose name it bears, in those which are his known and undoubted Writings.

BY this Proposition the criticks have made very considerable discoveries in later ages, not only among Ecclesiastical, but prophane authors; not only detecting the interpolations of the monks, but in fixing true and genuine titles to those pieces, which before went under false and feigned names. Thus Erasmus[g], Bellarmine[h], Sixtus Senensis[i], our learned countryman Cook[k], Rivet[l], Dr. Cave[m], and others, have happily contributed their parts in delivering us from reading books under borrowed titles; yea, and long before their time, the antient writers of Christianity were successful in discovering forgeries by the same method. Eusebius's works will supply us with many instances to this purpose.

He who has an intent to deceive, and publish a piece of his own for another's, may easily counterfeit his name, age, country, opinions; but will find it almost impossible with any exactness to imitate another's style. For as every man has his peculiar air in moving, speaking, &c. as every man has a peculiar turn of eye, cast of countenance and complexion, and many other things by which he is distinguishable from all others; so has every man a peculiar way of thinking and expressing his thoughts, as different from all others as in any of the other instances. And though it may be said, a man

[g] In many of his editions of the Fathers.
[h] De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis.
[i] Bibliotheca Sancta.
[k] Censura quorundam scriptorum.
[l] Critici Sacri specimen.
[m] Historia Literaria.

writes

writes in a very different ſtyle at different times, according to the different ſubjects he has to manage, his different age, his larger attainments by ſtudy, the different tempers in which the mind is at the times of writing, &c. yet ſtill there will be more or leſs of the old natural peculiarity viſibly remaining, by which he will appear to be the ſame, and not another who writes. Juſt as a man, though he change his country, become advanced in years, ſometimes ſmiles, ſometimes frowns, ſtill has the ſame countenance, the ſame ſmile or frown, which will diſtinguiſh him from all the reſt of mankind. *Jerome*, ſays Sixtus[n], *writes one way in his Epiſtles, another way in his Controverſies with Ruffin, another way in his Commentaries; one way when he was young, and his mind warm with the exerciſes of rhetorick; another way when he was old, writing on more ſerious ſubjects: yet he always writes ſo, that you may know him to be the ſame Jerome ſtill, as a man knows his friend under all the various caſts and turns of his countenance.* So likewiſe in every writer there will always be a peculiar way of ſetting his thoughts together, contexture of the diſcourſe, method of handling his ſubject, and ſomething diſtinguiſhing, which I can no more deſcribe, than that in a man's face, which makes him different from all the world. The mildneſs or haſtineſs of his temper, the ſerioufneſs or levity, the dulneſs or briſkneſs, the length or ſhortneſs, or ſome marks or other will ſtill appear. This St. Auſtin elegantly expreſſes of one of Cyprian's Epiſtles, which he proved genuine by it's ſtyle thus, *His ſtyle has a certain peculiar face, by which it may be known*[o].

After all, I confeſs, a perſon may be eaſily deceived in this matter; and therefore there is need of the greateſt care, and long and intimate acquaintance with the authors, of whom we thus judge: it being certain, that the ſtyle will ſtill be more eaſily diſcerned by us, in proportion as we have read the book. I have therefore, for the reader's aſſiſtance (if it will be any to him) collected, according to the beſt of my capacity, the

[n] Biblioth. ſanct. l. 4. in fine.

[o] Stylus ejus habet quandam propriam faciem, quâ poſſit agnoſci. Epiſt. ad Vincent. §. 39.

various

various ſtyles that I have obſerved in reading, and placed them in the following catalogue. He who would ſtudy the point farther, may read to good purpoſe what Tully and Quintilian have wrote on this ſubject.

A CATALOGUE *of the various* STYLES *of Authors.*

THE *Plain* or *Simple Style*; i. e. ſuch as is levelled to the capacity of moſt men, having the thoughts ranged in ſuch order, and expreſſed in ſuch words, as that moſt men will with eaſe underſtand them. It may be called the *Eaſy* or *Clear Style*, and is very remarkable in the hiſtorical books of the Old and New Teſtament.

2. The *Affected*, or *Rhetorical Style*, oppoſite to the former, viz. That which is laboured and abounds with words of uncommon uſe, and placed differently from the common way of ſpeech; what the Latins call *Oratio luxurians*, *Voces ſonoræ*, *Pompa & Lepor Verborum*. This, St. Paul ſays, he avoided, 1 Cor. ii. 1, 4. calling it *excellency of ſpeech*, and *enticing words of man's wiſdom*.

3. The *Perplexed* and *Involved Style*, having the thoughts placed in ſo uncommon an order, that it will require conſiderable pains to connect them; different from the former, in that it may be in very common and intelligible words, and alſo natural without affectation. This was the ſtyle of Tacitus and Tertullian among the antients, and Mr. Selden among the moderns.

4. The *Ruſtick*, or *Homely Style*, i. e. ſuch as is below the common ſtandard of the country, or what we call in Latin *Barbarous*. This more reſpects the words than the thoughts, and is the ſtyle of the Latin Vulgate Bible, and many of the Latin tranſlations of the Greek Fathers.

5. The *Strong* or *Nervous Style*, i. e. ſuch in which there are the moſt juſt reaſonings expreſſed in the moſt cogent words, or ſuch words as powerfully and fully convey all the ideas the author had. Such was certainly the ſtyle of St. Paul and Juſtin Martyr among the antients, and Archbiſhop Tillotſon and Mr. Locke among the moderns.

6. The

6. The *Languid*, or *Weak Style*, the oppoſite of the former, which does but faintly or in part convey the ideas of the author, or whoſe reaſonings are ſcarce concluſive. I need not produce inſtances of this ſort.

7. The *Sublime Style*, i. e. ſuch as leads the reader into uncommon ſpeculations about divine things. This may fully coincide with the *Simple*, as to the expreſſion, but muſt in ſome meaſure differ from it as to the thoughts, being uncommon, and ſuch as will require pains to take in; ſuch is the ſtyle of Iſaiah's Prophecy, in reſpect of the book of Eſther or Ruth.

8. The *Myſtical* or *Typical Style*, i. e. ſuch as makes uſe of former events to prove any point. This was the ſtyle much in uſe among the Jews in our Saviour's time, and was a ſtyle much affected and reputed by their learned men, and accordingly taught in their ſchools. Hence they had their Doctors, whom they called דרשנים and בעלי הדרש, whoſe buſineſs it was to find out myſtical and allegorical ſenſes of Scripture; and their בתי מדרש, i. e. the ſchools where this ſort of learning was taught[p]. Hence perhaps we may account for there being ſo much of this ſtyle in St. Paul's writings, he having had his education in the Jewiſh academy at Jeruſalem. This ſtyle is principally viſible in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, and the fourth chapter of his Epiſtle to the Galatians; and it is remarkable, that thoſe two Epiſtles, above the reſt which he wrote, concerned the Jewiſh converts. This ſtyle is alſo very much uſed in the Talmud, in Irenæus, Tertullian, and moſt of the firſt Chriſtian writers, eſpecially Origen. I wiſh thoſe who are ſo fond of this ſtyle, were able to give as good reaſon for their uſing it, as St. Paul could.

9. The *Parabolical Style*, i. e. ſuch as abounds with parables and ſimilitudes, as our Saviour's diſcourſes in the Goſpels.

[p] Vid. Fuller. Miſcell. Sacr. l. 3. c. 7. Scal. Elench. Trihær. c. 11. Camero in Myrothec. ad 1 Cor. i. 20. Thoſe authors, in the places cited, think St. Paul meant theſe Doctors by the word Συζητητὴς, 1 Cor. i. 20.

10. The

10. The *Theatrical Style*, i. e. ſuch in which there are frequent interlocutions, or dialogues. Of this there are many examples in St. Paul's writings, and more common and evident ones in Solomon's, eſpecially in his Eccleſiaſtes. Under this may be included the ſtyle in which there are many Proſopopœiæ; i. e. when inanimate things are introduced in the diſcourſe, and addreſſed to as perſons: This is frequent in Moſes [q], David [r], and the Prophets [s].

11. The *Humorous Style*, i. e. ſuch as abounds either with what they call wit, or what is an affectation of it, though quite different from it, viz. puns and jingles of words. Many of our practical writers of divinity in the laſt age dealt much in the latter of theſe, as too many of our beſt writers on the ſame ſubject have of late in the former: both of theſe may juſtly be ſaid, *ludere cum ſacris*.

12. The *Interrogatory Style*, i. e. ſuch in which are frequent addreſſes in the ſecond perſon; of which there are ſome examples in St. Paul's Epiſtles [t], and many in our warm writers of practical divinity.

13. The Style in which are *many Repetitions:* this is very remarkable in St. John [u].

14. The Style in which are *many Proverbs* or *Apophthegms* recited. Thoſe who are acquainted with the Jewiſh books, will know there is much more of this in our Saviour's ſtyle, than is commonly imagined [x].

15. The Style which *abounds with Parentheſes*, i. e. breaks off the ſentence with the interjection of other things, that do not properly belong to the argument, for its farther illuſtration: this is very common in St. Paul [y], and among later writers in Mr. Selden and Dr. Owen.

15. The *Conciſe* or *Sententious Style*; ſuch as Solomon's Proverbs.

[q] See Deut. iv. 26. xxx. 19. xxxii. 1.

[r] Pſal. xix. 1: lxv. 13. lxxvii. 16. xcvi. 11, 12. xcviii. 8. cxiv. 3.

[s] Iſai. i. 2.

[t] See Rom. viii. 31, &c. 1 Cor. ix. 10. ii. 9, 10, 11. and v. 12, 13, 14.

[u] Joh. viii. 21, 24. 1 Joh. i. 8,

[x] See Grotius and Hammond's Annotations, and Mr. Le Clerc's Paraphraſe on the Goſpels.

[y] Eph. ii. 1—6.

16. The

16. The *Prolix Style*, which is too common to need the producing any inſtances. Under this I include, not only length of periods, but multiplying of words.

17. The *Connected*, or *Coherent Style*, *which regards the Senſe*, and is commonly the ſtyle of mathematicians, and all good reaſoners: i. e. ſuch in which a ſentence depends upon the former, as the links of a chain, and in which nothing can be left out without ſpoiling the whole argument.

18. The *Connected*, or *Coherent Style*, *which reſpects the Words*, and indeed in ſome ſenſe (though very different from the former) *the Thoughts*; i. e. ſuch in which the laſt thought of the preceding ſentence gives occaſion to the thoughts of the enſuing ſentence, and ſo the laſt word of the preceding period is the firſt of the next, and ſo on. This ſtyle can ſeldom be uſed in arguing; it is very evident in the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter, and the firſt chapter of St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Coloſſians.

19. The *Looſe* or *Rambling Style* is too well known. Leſt it ſhould be thought, that this and the ſeventeenth coincide with the fifth and ſixth, viz. the *Nervous* and the *Languid*; I obſerve, that every coherent Style is not nervous, nor every languid Style incoherent.

20. The *Efficacious* or *Powerful Style*, peculiar to the Scriptures; i. e. the inward efficacy and power which is in them to reach and impreſs the conſciences of ſtupid ſinners. By this I mean ſomewhat different from any yet mentioned, and no other than what theſe books claim for themſelves, and are experienced to have, by thoſe who have felt the power of religion on their hearts. And though I own this Style is not of itſelf viſible till the Spirit and Grace of God make it ſo, and conſequently cannot (according to my Propoſition) be made uſe of to determine certainly concerning any author, as the others may, yet I mention it for the ſake of thoſe who allow,

1. That they have a greater aptneſs and tendency to impreſs men's minds, according to their intention, than any other books have.

2. That

2. That as David ſays [z], *The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the ſoul, &c.* or, as Paul expreſſes it [a], That *the Word of God is quick and powerful, and ſharper than any two-edged ſword; piercing even to the dividing aſunder of ſoul and ſpirit, and of the joints and marrow; and is a diſcerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.*

CHAP. XIII.

Several Propoſitions whereby the Spuriouſneſs of a Book may be diſcovered.

PROP. XII.

That Book is Spurious and Apocryphal, whoſe Idiom and Dialect is different from the known Idiom or Dialect of the Author whoſe Name it bears, or the Country where he lived.

THE idiom or dialect of a language is ſomewhat very different from the ſtyle of a writer, inaſmuch as all languages are ſuſceptible of all ſorts of ſtyles; the idiom of a language being what is common to a whole country, and differing from others only by ſome accidents; but the ſtyle of a writer is ſomewhat that is peculiar to himſelf, ariſing only from the vaſt and inexpreſſible variety of nature and conſtitution. Thus this Propoſition differs from the foregoing, but is proved by the ſame ſort of medium, viz. that as each particular perſon has one ſtyle, which another cannot imitate; ſo each country, or the language of each country, has its own idiom or peculiarities, which thoſe of another country can ſcarcely imitate to that perfection, but that the difference will be diſcernible. I confeſs, indeed, it ſeems to me a more eaſy matter to imitate a dialect, than a ſtyle; yet notwithſtanding this, the criticks in languages know well, there is

[z] Pſal. xix. 7, 8. [a] Heb. iv. 12.

ſomething in the genius of them, which is inimitable by thoſe of other countries; ſome words, ſome phraſes, or diſpoſition of words, which are never perfectly learnt. Beſides, as a writer cannot fully imitate the phraſeology of another country, ſo neither can he avoid the peculiarities of his own, though he be ſuppoſed to write in another language: theſe are what he has from his infancy been habituated and accuſtomed to, and become almoſt as natural to him as his own air and ſtyle. Hence Peter was diſcovered to be a Galilean at Jeruſalem (Matt. xxvi. 73.), though the language of the Jews and Galileans was very little different: juſt as an inhabitant of the Southern parts of England would immediately diſcover one of its Northern inhabitants, not by his words and tone only, but his dialect. Hence it ſeems not difficult, for inſtance, to diſtinguiſh between the Latin wrote by an Engliſhman, and that wrote by a Roman in Auguſtus's time. And it would, I believe, be impoſſible for a perſon now in any nation, to impoſe a book of his own writing under the name of any Roman writer, without being immediately detected. So certain it is, that each nation has its peculiar idiom and dialect; which may be yet farther confirmed by the known remark made by all who are acquainted with languages, viz. *that it is exceeding hard to do juſtice to an author, when he is tranſlated into another language*; the tranſlator finding himſelf perpetually at a loſs either for words or phraſes, or both, fully and exactly to expreſs the author's ideas.

The rule therefore laid down, muſt be of great ſervice to us, in detecting the ſpuriouſneſs or forgery of a book, the impoſture commonly ſhewing itſelf either in ſome words or phraſes not known in the country, where the pretended author lived, but peculiar to another; or elſe in an unnatural reſemblance and affectation of a dialect he was not ſufficiently acquainted with. Inſtances of this we may perhaps meet with hereafter; yet I cannot but add one remark here concerning the dialect of moſt of the writings of the New Teſtament, becauſe it will be a very demonſtrative evidence of the mighty power and force there is in the genius or nature of a language to ſhe itſelf: the remark I mean is *concerning the Hebraiſms*

of

of the New Teſtament. It is agreed on all hands, that moſt of thoſe books were originally written in Greek; but no one can be ignorant, how different the Greek is from that which was commonly ſpoke and wrote in the world at that time; ſo different in its idiom and phraſeology, that it muſt needs have puzzled the moſt celebrated linguiſts of Athens to have conſtrued the phraſes, if they had underſtood all the words. The truth is, the books were written by men who were born in Judæa, who had converſed in the Jewiſh, i. e. the Syriack, language from their childhood, and ſo had the idioms and peculiarities of it become perfectly natural to them; and hence, though they made uſe of Greek words, they conceiving after their former manner, placed their words after their wonted manner; i. e. in the Hebrew or Syriack dialect. Such is the language of moſt of the New Teſtament, of which, if it were neceſſary, it were eaſy to produce an hundred inſtances; which plainly ſhews how great the force of a perſon's natural language is, and how difficult it is to conceal it, even when he makes uſe of the words of another. And I dare venture to ſay, that the idioms of Latin or Greek would be as likely to ſhew themſelves, as thoſe of Hebrew; or that any Gentile writers would find it as difficult to avoid the idioms of their own country language, and imitate thoſe of Palæſtine, as the Jews did to avoid theirs, and imitate thoſe of other countries. I conclude therefore, that the idiom of the language of any book is a very likely means to judge of its genuineneſs; and if it be proved contrary to the known idiom of the people among whom its pretended author lived, that it is to be looked upon for that reaſon as ſpurious and Apocryphal.

PROP. XIII.

That Book is Spurious and Apocryphal, which evidences a Diſpoſition or Temper of Mind in its Author, different from the known Temper and Diſpoſition of the Author, whoſe Name it bears.

THE truth of this Propoſition depends upon theſe two known obſervations, viz. That there is a great variety in

the tempers of men's minds, and that it is next to impoſſible for a perſon ſo to conceal and diſguiſe himſelf, but that his natural temper will be more or leſs viſible: the pride or humility, the warmth or coolneſs, the dullneſs or briſkneſs, the courage or cowardice of the ſoul, and many other ſuch, are qualities ſo natural to it, ſo predominant in it, that a man may as eaſily alter the caſt of his complexion, or ſhape of his body, as ſo alter them that they ſhall become indiſcernible. David could not write, but he evidenced his humility: nor Cicero, but he evidenced his pride. St. Paul could not write without ſhewing the paſſionate vigour and warmth of his natural temper; nor St. John without ſhewing the ſedateneſs and mildneſs of his. I need not produce inſtances in a caſe ſo evident; I only would obſerve, that of all the tempers of the mind, none are more predominant, and more likely to ſhew themſelves in writing, than the proud or modeſt, the paſſionate and warm, or the cold and dull.

PROP. XIV.

That Book is Apocryphal, which for the moſt part is tranſcribed or ſtolen out of another.

NOTHING can be more evident than this. Every book, which is ſuppoſed Canonical, is at the ſame time ſuppoſed inſpired, or to be wrote under the conduct and influences of the Divine Spirit; but to be a plagiary, and under the conduct of inſpiration, is manifeſtly inconſiſtent. To ſuppoſe the Holy Spirit to aſſiſt one perſon in firſt writing, and then another perſon in tranſcribing or ſtealing out of that writing, is to ſuppoſe what is apparently abſurd and impious. It is abſurd, becauſe it is making inſpiration neceſſary, where nothing was leſs ſo, every one having natural powers ſufficient to tranſcribe a book, without any extraordinary aſſiſtance; and indeed, the little neceſſity there is for inſpiration in ſuch a caſe, is no weak argument to prove there was no inſpiration at all. Farther, as the ſuppoſition is abſurd in itſelf, ſo it is impious and prophane, viz. to make the Holy Spirit concur

to

to the production of a mere cheat and impoſture; for ſuch certainly is every book, that is compoſed out of another's works, without any intimation that it is ſo. Nor will the goodneſs of the plagiary's deſign at all alter the caſe; for whatever merit men may imagine in ſuch pious frauds, I hope none will think God himſelf ſo pleaſed with them, as to be the immediate author of them.

I am very well aware it may be here urged, that *two of the books now received into the Canon, ſeem to be taken out of, or tranſcribed from, two of the others*; viz. The Goſpel of St. Mark out of that of St. Matthew, and the Epiſtle of Jude out of that of St. Peter.

The objection is indeed ſpecious; to which I now anſwer only, that as to the common opinion of St. Mark's being an epitome of St. Matthew, I have elſewhere [b] largely diſproved it, and am ſo vain as to think, the arguments I have there formed againſt it may be ſufficient to convince any one of the falſehood of it. As to Jude's Epiſtle being an epitome of the ſecond Epiſtle of St. Peter, I ſhall defer the conſideration of it to a more convenient place hereafter.

CHAP. XIV.

The Syriack Verſion propoſed as a good Means to determine the Canon of the New Teſtament. An Hiſtorical Account of the Verſion.

PROP. XV.

The Tranſlation of the Books of the New Teſtament in Syriack is of very conſiderable Service in determining and fixing the Canon of thoſe Books.

THE truth of this Propoſition depends upon the antiquity of the Verſion; for if the moſt antient Chriſtians are to be judges, and their teſtimony is to determine in this mat-

[b] See my Vindication of St. Matthew's Goſpel againſt Mr. Whiſton, Chap. vi—x.

ter (as has been proved, Prop III.), their judgment can no way be more evident, than in the collection or choice which they made of books to be tranſlated into their own language; and if ſuch collection of books was made by the Eaſtern churches in the time, or at leaſt near the time of the Apoſtles, it muſt conſequently be of great weight in deciding this matter. That therefore which is incumbent on me, in order to eſtabliſh this new Propoſition, is to ſhew, *that the Syriack Verſion of the New Teſtament was made in or near the Apoſtles' times.* And in this matter I ſhall think it worth while to be ſomewhat particular and large, not only becauſe the proof of this will be of ſuch prodigious ſervice to our preſent purpoſe, and to many other valuable ends; but hereby hoping withal to do ſomewhat towards reviving the credit of this moſt antient monument of Chriſtianity, and influencing ſome at leaſt to learn the language of this Verſion, which is both ſo uſeful and ſo eaſily learnt.

In my Vindication of St. Matthew's Goſpel, I have attempted ſomething of this ſame ſort; but as that happened to be in the laſt ſheet of the book, the inconveniency of the preſs obliged me to contract my thoughts; for which reaſon, as well as for the ſake of thoſe who have not ſeen that book, I ſhall not judge it amiſs to make uſe of any thing which I have there ſaid, adding any diſcoveries I have ſince made on the ſubject. In managing of which I will produce,

1. All that is hiſtorical concerning it.
2. The judgments of learned men about it.
3. Some arguments by which the antiquity of the Verſion will be eſtabliſhed.

1. *As to the hiſtory of this Verſion.* It is a conſtant and antient tradition among the Syrians, that *it was made by Saint Mark.* This account we have from Poſtellus, who travelled into the Eaſtern parts of the world, in order to inform himſelf of all that he could among them, who declares, that the Syrians delivered it to him as an antient tradition, *that St. Mark tranſlated his own Goſpel, and the reſt of the books of the New Teſtament, into his own country's* [*i. e. the Galilean*

or Syriack] language[c]. The firſt time the Europeans became acquainted with this Verſion, was in the year of Chriſt 1562, on this occaſion: Ignatius, a Patriarch of Antioch, hearing of the advantages of printing, ſent a certain prieſt of Meſopotamia, called Moſes Meridinæus, into Europe with a copy of the Syriack Teſtament, to be printed for the benefit of the Chriſtians in thoſe Eaſtern parts of the world; who, failing in the execution of his deſign both at Rome and at Venice, at length fortunately met with Albertus Widmanſtadius in Germany, who with the encouragement and aſſiſtance of the then Emperor Ferdinand, cauſed it to be printed in Syriack characters[d]. In this edition were wanting, *the ſecond Epiſtle of Peter, the ſecond and third Epiſtles of John, the Epiſtle of Jude, and the Revelation.* After this edition of Widmanſtadius at Vienna, ſeveral others were ſoon publiſhed by Tremellius, Guido Fabritius (who had the advantage of an antient manuſcript, which the aforementioned Poſtellus procured in his travels in the Levant country), Troſtius, and others. All theſe were publiſhed without the four mentioned Catholick Epiſtles, and the Revelation; though theſe have been ſince added in the later editions of the French and Engliſh Polyglotts, and thoſe of Gutbirius and Schaaf, for which the world is obliged to Mr. Pocock of Oxford, and the learned De Dieu; the former of which firſt publiſhed the four Epiſtles out of an antient manuſcript, that lay concealed in the Bodleian at Oxford, and the latter the Revelation, out of a manuſcript of Scaliger's in the library at Leyden. This is all I know relating to the hiſtory of this Verſion; except that I have ſomewhere read, that ſome of the Syrians aſcribe this Verſion to Thaddæus, one of the Apoſtles, as its author, who compoſed it for Abgarus, king of Edeſſa; and that there are ſeveral manuſcripts of the whole, or ſome parts of the tranſlation now in Europe; viz. two in the Duke of Florence's library, one of which is above a thouſand years old, the other not much leſs; three in the French King's not very old, one of

[c] Guid. Fabrit. Præfat. in Syr. Teſt.

[d] See the Prefaces of the ſeveral editions, eſpecially that of Schaaf's.

which Gutbirius had from Conſtantine l'Empereur, that of Poſtellus, and thoſe above-mentioned [e].

2. I propoſed in the next place to ſhew, *what the judgment and opinion of learned men concerning the antiquity of this Verſion has been.* And though I never thought numbers any evidence of truth, yet they certainly are of appearance of truth; and it muſt needs be very unreaſonable to ſuppoſe a great number of diſintereſted perſons of ſenſe and learning would receive that for truth, which at leaſt had not ſome plauſible reaſons to ſupport it; ſuch certainly is the caſe in reſpect of this tranſlation.

The firſt I produce is Tremellius, who publiſhed it and tranſlated it into Latin. "By whom," ſays he, "or by what "authors, or what time the Syriack Verſion was made out "of its original Greek, we are not yet able poſitively to de- "termine, any more than concerning the authors who made "the Greek Verſion of the Old Teſtament, and the old Latin "Vulgate; *But it ſeems every way probable, that it was made* "*in the very infancy of the Church of Chriſt, either by the* "*Apoſtles themſelves or their diſciples*; unleſs we will imagine "them in their writings to have had a concern only for the "Churches of foreign nations, and none for thoſe of their "own country [f]."

Our learned Mr. Fuller [g] calls it, *moſt antient, a very excellent and truly divine monument of Chriſtianity.*

Alſted [h], "*The Syriack Verſion of the New Teſtament is to* "*be attributed to the Church of Antioch, while yet in its in-* "*fancy, and to thoſe in that city who were firſt called Chriſtians*; "and though the author of it be not certainly known, *yet it* "*is very likely it was made either by ſome Apoſtles, or their* "*diſciples.*

Jacobus Martini, in his Preface to Troſtius's edition [i], "It is a Verſion, but *the firſt and moſt antient of all*—it is a "Verſion *preferable to all others*; it is a Verſion *made either*

[e] Simon. Critic. Hiſt. of the New Teſt. Par. 2. c. 14.

[f] Præfat. in Verſ. Syr.

[g] Miſcel. Sacr. lib. 3. c. 20.

[h] Præcognit. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 113.

[i] See more of this in that Preface.

"*by*

" *by one of the Evangeliſts, or by ſome of the Chriſtians at* " *Antioch*, who had the opportunity of conſulting with the " Apoſtles there."

Frederick Spanheim the father[k] had the ſame opinon of its antiquity.

Biſhop, Walton has attempted to prove it was made in the Apoſtles' time[l].

Frederick Spanheim the ſon[m], in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, *places this Verſion in the ſecond century after Chriſt*; aſſenting to the agreed opinion of learned men, that it was made very near the Apoſtles' time.

Father Simon no where contradicts the above-mentioned opinions, but allows its claim to the greateſt antiquity juſt; and well obſerves, that *it preceded all thoſe ſchiſms, which afterwards divided the Eaſtern nations into different ſects: and this*, he adds, *is the cauſe why they all equally eſteem it*[n].

Such have been the received ſentiments of the learned concerning this Verſion, though I confeſs none of theſe, or any other I have met with, ſeem to have treated the ſubject with that accuracy, or in that full manner its importance requires. I ſhall therefore make it the buſineſs of the following chapter, to evince its true antiquity in the cleareſt and beſt method I am able.

[k] Dub. Evang. Par. 1. Dub. 23. §. 4. & Par. 2. Dub. 5. §. 4.

[l] Prolegom. in Polyglott. 13. §. 15.

[m] Hiſtor. Chriſt. Sæcul. 2. c. 7.

[n] Critic. Hiſtor. of the N. Teſt. Par. 2. c. 13.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

An Attempt towards proving, that the Syriack Verſion was made in the Apoſtles' Times: a particular Account of the Syriack Language; its Riſe, Nature, and Uſe among the Jews in our Saviour's Time.

HAVING given the hiſtory and judgments of others about the Syriack Verſion, I am now to endeavour,

3. *To eſtabliſh its antiquity.* And here I find it neceſſary to premiſe, that ſuch proof is not to be expected here, as of ſome other facts near the Apoſtles' times, becauſe we have now extant ſcarce any Chriſtian writings of thoſe times, by men who underſtood this language, except the Apoſtles themſelves. Notwithſtanding, I hope the following Obſervations will make it ſomething more than probable, that the Syriack Verſion was made in or near the Apoſtles' times.

Obſ. 1. *The Chriſtian Religion was firſt publiſhed and received in Syria.* I need not particularly enter into the geography of this country; it is certain the limits of it have been variouſly deſcribed by the antients: it is enough for me to obſerve, that in the time, to which my ſubject relates, under the name Syria was included all that part of Aſia, which was bounded on the North by mount Amanus, which ſeparated it from Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Armenia; on the Eaſt by the river Euphrates, which ſeparated it from Meſopotamia; on the South by Arabia; on the Weſt by that which is called the Syrian Sea, or the end of the Mediterranean, and part of Egypt[o]. In theſe confines Chriſtianity had its birth, and here it firſt ſpread. This is evident to thoſe, who are acquainted with the hiſtory of the Goſpels, and the Acts of the Apoſtles, and conſider, that in this country was Judæa, Samaria, Phœnicia, &c. and that in it were Jeruſalem, the towns of Galilee, Damaſcus, Antioch, Cæſarea, Seleucia, and others, which we read of ſo often in the forementioned

[o] Vide Cluver. Geogr. l. 5. c. 20.

hiſtory,

hiſtory, where the firſt Churches of Chriſtians were planted. In this country our Saviour lived and preached: in this country the Apoſtles firſt travelled and ſpread the Goſpel; here they made immediately innumerable converts, and formed them into Churches profeſſing the Religion of Chriſt. At Jeruſalem many (μυριάδες) ten thouſands ſoon embraced Chriſtianity[p]. The city and country of Samaria was converted by Philip's preaching, and confirmed in their faith by Peter and John[q]. Philip publiſhed the Goſpel all the way from thence to Cæſarea[r]. St. Paul's deſign to perſecute at Damaſcus, is a proof there were great numbers of Chriſtians there[s], which himſelf afterwards confirmed and increaſed[t]. Peter by his miracles and preaching mightily augmented the number of Chriſtians at Joppa[u], and was ſucceſsful in making proſelytes at Cæſarea[x]. The Apoſtles, who were diſperſed upon the perſecution of Stephen, baptized many to the Chriſtian faith in Phœnicia and Antioch[y], where Barnabas being ſent, made large additions of converts[z], and afterwards together with Paul preached among them for a whole year[a]. Thus was this large country of Syria, with its principal cities and towns converted to Chriſtianity, by the preaching of the Apoſtles, within the ſpace of ten or twelve years.

Obſ. 2. *The language of all theſe converts was Syriack, or the ſame with that tranſlation we are now diſcuſſing.* I mean, not ſo exactly the ſame, as that there were no various dialects; it is plain there were by the inſtance of Peter, whoſe dialect proved him to be a Galilean[b]; but that they were alſo intelligible to one another, plainly appears by the ſame inſtance; the difference in the way of ſpeaking in one part of this country from another, ſeeming to have been no more, than in one part of England from another. The language is indeed ſometimes called Chaldee, ſometimes Syriack, ſometimes Syro-Chaldaick; but moſt commonly by the writers of the New

[p] Acts xxi. 20.
[q] Acts viii. 5, 14, 25.
[r] Ib. ver. 40.
[s] Acts ix. 1, 2, 19.
[t] Ib. 20, 22.
[u] Ib. 42.
[x] Chap. x.
[y] Acts xi. 19, &c.
[z] Ib. 22.
[a] Ib. 26.
[b] Matt. xxvi. 73.

Teſtament,

Teſtament, and firſt Chriſtrian writers, it is called Hebrew. I need not now enter into any critical enquiries concerning the language; only for the ſake of thoſe who are unacquainted with theſe things, I ſhall lay down the following remarks, which, if it were neceſſary, it would be no difficult matter to confirm.

1. *The original or primeval language of the world was Hebrew* [c].

2. *This continued univerſal till the Flood, and ſo on till the attempt of building of the tower of Babel*; for then the whole earth was of one language, and of one ſpeech [d], about ſeventeen hundred and fifty years after the Creation.

3. *At that time there was a confuſion of languages*; and men being ſcattered into different parts of the earth, and not converſing with each other, formed different dialects of ſpeech [e].

4. *Theſe ſeem to have been no other than the various dialects of the old Hebrew; as Chaldee, Syriack, Arabick*, and the other languages of that Eaſtern part of the world are: juſt as from the Latin we ſee the Italian, French, and Spaniſh had their original [f].

5. *The Chaldee or Syriack dialect was the language of Syria and Meſopotamia, and the adjacent country.* This is evident from the title Laban the Syrian put upon his monument, viz. יגר שהדותא, which are plain Syriack or Chaldee words [g]; and from Rabſhakeh's ſpeech to the Jews, which is expreſsly ſaid to be delivered ארמית, i. e. in Syriack [h].

6. *The family of Abraham, through all their various ages, retained their old Hebrew language pure and uncorrupt till the Babyloniſh Captivity.* This is evident, becauſe all the books of the Old Teſtament wrote before that time are in that language; and in the laſt-cited place, the Jewiſh officers deſired to communicate with Rabſhakeh in Syriack, and not in Hebrew, that ſo the common people in Jeruſalem might not underſtand them.

[c] Bochart. Phaleg, l. 1. c. 15.
[d] Gen. xi. 1.
[e] Ib. ver. 9.
[f] Vid. Le Clerc Diſſert. de Lingu. Heb. præfix. Comment. in Pentateuch.
[g] Gen. xxxi. 47.
[h] 2 King. xviii. 26.

7. *After*

7. *After the Captivity they forgot their own Hebrew, and learnt the language of the Chaldeans or Syrians, or rather mixed it with their own.* This appears, in that a great part of the books of Ezra and Daniel, which were wrote after the Captivity, are wrote in this language; and they had need of interpreters to tranſlate the other books, when they were read in the ſynagogues in Hebrew, which they did not underſtand, into Chaldee which they did [i].

8. *This Chaldean or Syriack language, or, as ſome call it, Syro-Chaldaick dialect, was the language of Jeruſalem and Galilee, and all the country about, in our Saviour's time.* There needs no other proof of this, than the great number of Syriack words, which are now remaining in the Greek Teſtament; ſuch as Talitha Kumi [k], Ephphatha [l], Eloi, Eloi, Lama ſabachthani [m]; Bethesda [n], Golgotha [o], Gabbatha [p], Raca [q], Cephas [r], Aceldama [s], Boanerges [t], Maran-atha [u], Bar-Jona [x], Abba [y], &c. Theſe are all evidently Syriack words (as they know, who are the leaſt acquainted with the language), and ſuch as were in common uſe among the Jews, in our Saviour's time. I would only obſerve farther concerning one of theſe Syriack words, viz. Aceldama, that it is ſaid to be ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν, i. e. *in their own dialect, which they then ſpake.*

Thoſe who are not acquainted with theſe ſtudies will be very likely to object here, *that we read nothing of the Syriack in the New Teſtament, but that the words above are commonly called Hebrew*; which is indeed true, as alſo that the firſt Chriſtian writers commonly call the language of the Jews at this time Hebrew. But it is eaſy to anſwer, that Hebrew being the old language, and the other derived from it, and not very different, it is no wonder the Jews were fond of the old name, and always retained it. And as to the Fathers, it

[i] Lightfoot, Harm. New Teſt. §. 17.
[k] Mark v. 41.
[l] Ib. vii. 34.
[m] Ib. xv. 34.
[n] John v. 2.
[o] Matt. xxvii. 33.
[p] John xix. 13.
[q] Matt. v. 22.
[r] John i. 42.
[s] Acts i. 19.
[t] Mark iii. 17.
[u] 1 Cor. xvi. 22.
[x] Matt. xvi. 17.
[y] Mark xiv. 36.

cannot

cannot be ſtrange, they ſhould call it as the Jews did, they generally being ignorant of either language; though Juſtin Martyr, who lived in Syria, ſpeaks of Hebrew and Syriack, as of one and the ſame language, *Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p.* 331. And the moſt learned of the Fathers, Jerome, who underſtood both, perpetually obſerves the difference; and Nonnius, who lived in the fourth century, in his Paraphraſe on St. John's Goſpel in Greek verſe, for Hebrew puts Syriack. So on John xix. 13.

Γαββαθὰ παφλάζοντι Σύρῳ κικλήσκετο μύθῳ.

And verſe 17. of the ſame chapter,

Γολγοθὰ τὸν καλέεσκε Σύρων γόμα, &c.

And verſe 20. concerning the inſcription on the croſs,

Αὐσονίῃ γλώσσῃ τε Σύρῳ καὶ Ἀχαϊδὶ φωνῇ.

It is plain then, that Syriack was the language of Judea in our Saviour's time, that in which himſelf and his Apoſtles converſed and preached. Mr. Voſſius is the only one I know of a contrary opinion; he thinks the common language of Jeruſalem and that country was Greek[z]; but it is plain from Acts xxi. 37. the common Jews did not underſtand that language; and Joſephus expreſsly tells us[a], that *it was a ſtrange language to him and his countrymen.* If any one has a mind to ſee more of this controverſy, he may ſee it warmly managed between Father Simon[b] and Voſſius[c], in the books cited in the margin. All that I ſhall farther add, is, that inaſmuch as I have promiſcuouſly above uſed the words Chaldee and Syriack, the reaſon thereof is, becauſe thoſe two dialects are ſo very much alike, and indeed almoſt the ſame, as every one knows, who is acquainted with the very rudiments of them, and may be very eaſily perceived by thoſe, who have not learnt the languages, if they will but caſt their eye upon Buxtorf's Chaldee and Syriack Grammar; or perhaps more clearly, if they conſult that incomparable Harmonical Grammar of the Orientals compiled by Erneſtus Gerhardus, founded upon Schickard's He-

[z] Voſſ. Reſponſ. ad iterat. P. Simon. Object.

[a] Præfat. in Antiq. Jud. & Præfat. in Bell. Judaic.

[b] Critical Hiſtory of the N. Teſt. Par. 1. c. 6.

[c] Lib. jam. cit.

brew

brew Rules. The truth is, there is ſcarce any difference at all between them, ſave only in a few words, and the punctuation. *There would be but little difference viſible between Chaldee and Syriack* (ſays the learned critick in theſe languages, Lud. de Dieu [d]), *if thoſe who affixed the points to them had thought it fit. I diſtinguiſh them,* ſays he, *becauſe others do; and ſome little difference there is in forming the words; elſe for my part I own them to be one and the ſame language* [e]. So Amira [f], and to the ſame purpoſe our celebrated countryman Fuller [g]; *the Chaldee and Syriack dialects are not ſo properly ſaid to be alike, as to be almoſt the ſame.* And in another place [h] accounts for it by a learned proof, that the Syrians and Chaldeans were one and the ſame people. And I cannot but obſerve here, that what the prophet Daniel in one place calls לשון כשדים, i. e. *the language of the Chaldeans* [i], in the next chapter is called ארמית, i. e. Syriack [k].

CHAP. XVI.

Several Obſervations, which prove the Syriack Verſion made in or near the Apoſtles' Times.

Obſ. 3. *IT was abſolutely needful, that a Verſion ſhould be made; and therefore very probable, a Verſion was made of the books of the New Teſtament into the Syriack language, in or near the Apoſtles' times.*

This Obſervation naturally ariſes and follows from the two foregoing; for if, as has been proved, an innumerable multitude of perſons were converted to Chriſtianity in Jeruſalem and Galilee, in Cæſarea, Damaſcus, Samaria, Joppa, Lydda, Antioch, and all over Syria; if the language of all

[d] See his Preface to his Syriack and Chaldee Grammar.
[e] Ibid.
[f] Prælud. in Gram. Syr. ſeu Chald.
[g] Miſcell. Sacr. l. 1. c. 1.
[h] Lib. 3. c. 20.
[i] Dan. i. 4.
[k] Ib. ii. 4.

this

this country was Syriack, there can be nothing more unreaſonable than to ſuppoſe, they were for any long time deſtitute of thoſe inſpired books, which contained the foundations of their new Religion. To ſuppoſe this, would argue them either to have very little knowledge of, or very little zeal for, their profeſſion; neither of which was the caſe we are ſure. Nothing can be more reaſonably concluded, than that upon the foregoing hypotheſis, either the Apoſtles or themſelves would take care to have a good Verſion as ſoon as might be.

1. *It may with a great deal of reaſon be ſuppoſed, that ſome one or other of the Apoſtles would take care to have the ſacred books of Chriſtianity publiſhed among the Churches of Syria in their own language.* This would be the beſt and moſt likely means of preſerving and propagating thoſe doctrines and that faith, which they had declared among them. Without this, I cannot ſee, how they could expect any other than the ſpeedy decay of the Chriſtian Religion after their time, even when it made the moſt flouriſhing figure in their time. On the other hand, a Verſion (made by themſelves, or a perſon of their appointment) of their writings into the language of the country, would be a very probable method of advancing the work they had been ſo long labouring in, of keeping up thoſe truths, which elſe muſt have been forgot, and of preventing thoſe errors and hereſies, which they ſaw ſpringing up in the Church, &c.

2. If we ſuppoſe the Apoſtles thus negligent of the intereſts of Chriſtianity, *it will be very abſurd to imagine the faithful Chriſtians themſelves to be negligent in a matter of ſuch importance, in which they could not but ſee themſelves ſo nearly concerned.* The zeal for the Chriſtian Religion, which they evidenced in forſaking all on its account, and expoſing themſelves to the rage and malice of the world, would ſure make them ſolicitous to have the genuine and authentick memoirs of it in their own language. For inſtance, the converts at Jeruſalem, in whom there muſt needs be by education the greateſt eſteem for all thoſe books, which they believed did come from God; can it be thought, they would not endeavour to have the Hiſtory of the Life and Doctrines of Chriſt, as well as the Old Teſtament tranſlated into their known language,

language, eſpecially when they certainly believed the inſpiration of the one as well as the other? I might farther argue this from the character of Ignatius, Biſhop of Antioch, and other Biſhops of Syria, who muſt needs be very defective in their duty to the Churches over which they were ſet, if they did not take care they ſhould be ſupplied with the inſpired volumes, which themſelves valued ſo much. I conclude therefore, that as a Verſion into Syriack was neceſſary to be made in or near the Apoſtles' time, ſo it is probable one was then made.

Obſ. 4. *The Chriſtians of Syria were wont to read the ſacred Scriptures of the New Teſtament in their Churches and publick aſſemblies very ſoon after the Apoſtles' time; and therefore a tranſlation of them was then made into the Syriack language.*

Although I might confirm this Obſervation by many inſtances, yet the inſtance which I ſhall produce being ſo demonſtrative of the fact, I ſhall content myſelf with producing only that. The paſſage I refer to is that of Juſtin Martyr, who lived in the beginning of the ſecond century, and plainly ſpeaks of himſelf as being *a diſciple of the Apoſtles*, Ἀποστόλων γενόμενος μαθητής[l]. He tells us, that in their religious aſſemblies *every Sunday the writings of the Apoſtles and Prophets were read*[m]. Now Juſtin was a native, as he himſelf ſays[n], of Palæſtine in Syria, viz. Neapolis in Samaria, in which country, as has been proved, Syriack was the language. Now unleſs a Verſion was made of the Apoſtles' writings into this language, it had been very prepoſterous for them, to have read them in their Churches; unleſs we ſuppoſe them like the later Papiſts, who will neither ſuffer tranſlations of the Scriptures to be made into other languages, nor any other to be read in the Churches, but ſuch as the people do not underſtand. This argument I look upon as concluſive, and therefore ſhall anticipate an objection or two, which ſome perhaps may be apt to raiſe againſt it. As,

[l] Epiſt. ad Diognet. p. 501.
[m] Apol. 2. pro Chriſt. p. 98.
[n] Præf. in Apol. 2. p. 53.

1. *That Juſtin dwelt at Rome, and not in Syria*, where he was born. To which I anſwer, that though it be certain Juſtin was at Rome [o], yet the accounts we have of him ſeem to intimate, that he went there *only with a view of preſenting his memorials for the Chriſtian Religion to the Emperor and Senate*, and that he was not a reſident of Rome; and therefore when this was done, he returned again to Aſia, and at Epheſus he had that famous diſpute with Trypho the Jew, which is ſtill extant [p]. This ſeems not unlikely to have been either as he was going to Rome from Syria, or returning to Syria from Rome; becauſe in the end of the diſpute [q] he tells us, they *prayed for his ſafety in the voyage he was then going to make*. It is true indeed, the words in Euſebius [r], Ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης τὰς διατριβὰς ἐποιεῖτο, are commonly tranſlated [s] as though they expreſſed his fixed habitation at Rome; but the words imply no ſuch thing, but more properly are ſignificative of ſuch a continuance, as is made by a traveller on a journey; and ſo we find the word διατρίβω is continually made uſe of in the New Teſtament, to denote the continuance of our Saviour and his Apoſtles for a few days in a place, till they removed to another [t]. Beſides, there is another ſenſe, which may be given to Euſebius's words, much better than that of his tranſlators, viz. if we take διατριβὰς ποιεῖν to ſignify his *having publick conferences, and making public diſcourſes*. This ſeems moſt agreeable to the context of Euſebius; and is moſt evident in that Jerome [u] and Photius [x], ſpeaking of Juſtin's being at Rome, inſtead of διατριβὰς ἐποιεῖτο have διατριβὰς ἔσχε, which can be taken in no other than the ſenſe laſt given; eſpecially if we conſider, that Photius adds the word φιλοσοφῶν, which, though it be not placed ſo as to be connected with διατριβὰς, yet evidently ought to be, and the firſt Latin tranſlator read it

[o] Vide Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 16. Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccl. in Juſtin. & Phot. Bibliothec. Cod. cxxv.

[p] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 18.

[q] Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. in fine.

[r] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 11. in fine.

[s] Vid. Verſ. Chriſtophorſon. & Valeſ.

[t] John iii. 22. xi. 54. Acts xii. 19. xiv. 3, 28. xv. 35. xvi. 12. xx. 6. and ſeveral other places.

[u] Catal. Script. Eccl. in Juſtin.

[x] Phot. Biblioth. cxxv.

ſo.

ſo[y]. I conclude therefore, that Juſtin's abode at Rome was only as a ſtranger or traveller, and that Syria, his native country, was ſtill his home; and conſequently, when he declares to the Emperor the cuſtoms of the Chriſtian aſſemblies, he means the Churches in Syria; and ſo that a Verſion was made in the Syriack language, becauſe the writings of the New Teſtament were read in them.

2. It may be farther objected, that Juſtin could not ſpeak of the books of the New Teſtament being read in the Syrian Churches, and that he himſelf did not reſide in Syria, *becauſe he was unacquainted with the Hebrew or Syriack language*, as ſeems to be evident from his works. Dr. Cave produces a very remarkable inſtance of it[z], viz. *his deriving the word Satana from Sata, which*, ſays he, *in the language of the Jews and Syrians ſignifies an Apoſtate, and Nas* (on which account he is called a Serpent) *and denotes the ſame as Sata in their language*[a].

To which I anſwer, that though the derivation be, as Dr. Cave ſays, very childiſh and ridiculous, becauſe every one who knows any thing of Hebrew now is ſure it is derived from the verb שטן, which ſignifies *to hate with malice*, yet I think it cannot hence be concluded, that Juſtin did not live in Syria: for,

(1.) *The verb* שטן *was not in the Syriack language, but another always made uſe of inſtead of it.* As there are in the Syriack abundance of words, which are not in the old Hebrew, ſo abundance in Hebrew, which were not in Syriack. As the language altered, many words were both brought in and left out, among which this was one: this I conclude, becauſe another verb is always made uſe of in the Syriack Verſion of the New Teſtament to denote the idea, and never this; ſo that a native of Syria could not give a juſt etymology of this word, without being acquainted with the old Hebrew, which at that time, it is certain, was known but to very few, eſpecially out of Jeruſalem.

[y] Vid. Verſ. Lat. hujus loci Phot. præfix. Opp. Juſtin. Mart. viz. *Philoſophicæ ibidem Diatribas habuit.*

[z] Hiſtor. Liter. in Juſtin.

[a] Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 331.

(2.) *Suppoſe the verb* שטן *had been common in Syriack, it will be a mighty ſtrange conſequence to infer, that Juſtin was not an inhabitant of Syria, becauſe he thought another verb or noun in the ſame language, and not that, was the root of any particular word.* Were I to make uſe of the ſame argument in reſpect of an European language, and to conclude, for inſtance, a perſon was not an inhabitant of England, becauſe he could not tell, or ſhould miſtake the Latin or Saxon original of any Engliſh word; the reaſoning would be apparently very weak, and the conſequence would be, that but a very few inhabitants would be left in England. The caſe is exactly the ſame.

(3.) *This verb was not common in the Hebrew itſelf*, not being above once or twice to be found in the Hebrew Bible.

(4.) *Juſtin, though a Samaritan or native of Palæſtine, was born of Gentile parents*; as appears by the names of his father and grandfather, which, he ſays [b], were *Priſcus* and *Bacchius*; was educated in the philoſophy and learning of Greece, as is evident from the accounts of Euſebius, Jerome, and Photius [c]; and therefore, though he might underſtand his own country language, it is not at all ſtrange he was no critick in it. But,

(5.) For proof that Juſtin underſtood Syriack, I think we need go no farther than this very place which is objected. If he had not, *how did he know the word Satana was of Hebrew or Syriack original, and apply to that language for its etymology?* Why did he not, as other Fathers unacquainted with this language are often ridiculouſly wont [d], apply to the Greek for its original? This evidently proves he knew the language. Beſides, to put the matter paſt all controverſy, I obſerve, upon a cloſe and critical enquiry, the two words (viz. *Sata*

[b] Præf. in Apol. 2. Jerome indeed ſeems to take them as one name of his father, but is miſtaken. Vid. Valeſ. ad Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 12.

[c] Locis ſupra citatis.

[d] Thus Lactantius Divin. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 26. and others, derive *Paſcha, the Paſſover*, from the Greek πάσχω *to ſuffer*, becauſe Chriſt ſuffered at the Paſſover, or becauſe that was typical of Chriſt. Others derive the name Jeſus from ἰάω *ſano*, &c. which etymologies every body knows are trifling.

and

and *Nas*, from which he derives *Satanàs*) *are purely and properly Syriack words*, which denote very exactly the nature of Satan, or the Devil, as it is repreſented in Scripture. This diſcovery I take to be of ſome conſequence, and therefore ſhall endeavour to ſhew it more clearly.

1.) *The firſt word is Sata*; *this*, ſays Juſtin, *ſignifies an Apoſtate, in the language of the Jews and Syrians*; and ſo, I obſerve, it does. The original Hebrew verb is שׂטן which ſignifies *to ſeduce*, or *deceive*, or *draw aſide*, and is the very word made uſe of to expreſs Satan's ſeducing David to number the people[e]. Hence came the verb שׂטה very common in Chaldee, *to draw aſide*, or *go aſide*, and the Syriack ܣܛܐ ſignifying the very ſame; and ſo the participle Peal of this verb in Syriack will denote *one that goes aſide*, or *an Apoſtate* and *deceiver of others*, and that participle is ܣܛܳܝܳܐ *Sate*, or *Sata*, the very word that Juſtin produces. This verb is very common in this ſenſe in the Syriack tranſlation of the New Teſtament; and Gal. iii. 19. the noun derived from it ſignifies *Apoſtacy*. The reader learned in theſe things may ſee the inſtances in Dr. Caſtell's Polyglot Lexicon, and Schaaf's and Troſtius's Syriack Lexicons.

2.) *The other word is Nas*. *This*, ſays Juſtin, *ſignifies the ſame as Sata in Hebrew or Syriack*, and denotes that, on the account of which Satan is called Serpent. Nothing can be more juſt than this. The word is apparently Syriack, derived from the known Hebrew root נסה, which in Piel ſignifies *to tempt*, and is uſed of God's tempting Abraham[f]. In the Syriack it is often uſed in the ſame ſenſe; and the noun formed from it denotes frequently *the Tempter*[g], on which account Satan is called Serpent. So that nothing can be more evident, than that Juſtin underſtood the Syriack language; and conſequently his want of knowledge of it can be no objection to his living in Syria. I conclude therefore, that if

[e] 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. The word *Satan* is not indeed in our preſent copies in that place; but either it by ſome means dropt out of the text, or at leaſt muſt be ſupplied from 1 Chron. xxi. 1. where it is. Vid. Cleric. Comm. in loc.

[f] Gen. xxii. 1.

[g] See the Lexicons cited above.

 66957 the

the writings of the New Teſtament were read in the Churches, where Juſtin Martyr lived, they were read in Syria; and if they were read in Syria, they were read in the Syriack language, becauſe no other was there underſtood, and conſequently a tranſlation of the New Teſtament into Syriack was made out of Greek in Juſtin Martyr's time, i. e. within a few years of the Apoſtles' time.

It cannot be improper here to add, that in the book which goes under Juſtin Martyr's name, called *Quæſt. & Reſponſ. ad Orthodox.* I find mention of a Syriack tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, as there is alſo in St. Auſtin's famous book *De Civit. Dei*, l. 15. c. 13. I might argue from hence the great probability of a Verſion being made of the New alſo into the ſame tongue; but, I confeſs, I queſtion the genuineneſs of that book, there being ſomething in it certainly later than Juſtin; and yet I cannot but think the learned Dr. Cave's conjecture[h] concerning it deſerves conſidering, that perhaps it may be that piece of Juſtin's, which Photius calls *Solutiones Summariæ Dubitationum adverſus Religionem*, only much interpolated. This conjecture ſeems probable, which, though the learned Doctor propoſes as his own[i], was made long before him by Andr. Rivet[k], from whom it is evident he borrowed it, though he mentions not his name. This is the more obſervable, becauſe that learned writer in the page before treats Sandius very roughly, for propoſing an opinion of Rivet's in the ſame place as his own, without mentioning Rivet's name[l].

[h] Hiſt. Liter. in Juſtin. Martyr.

[i] Loc. cit.

[k] Critic. Sacr. lib. 2. c. 5. §. 3.

[l] That opinion is, that this book cannot be Juſtin's, becauſe he, being a Samaritan, would never have interpreted the Syriack word *Oſanna* by μεγαλωσύνη ὑπερκειμένη, when it is evidently of another ſignification. Vid. Quæſt. & Reſponſ. ad Orthod. Quæſt. 50.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

The Syriack Verſion proved to be made in or near the Apoſtles' Times from ſome internal Evidences.

Obſ. 5. *THE Syriack Verſion of the New Teſtament now extant is very probably the ſame, which was made in or near the Apoſtles' time.*

1. *This is conſtantly aſſerted by the Syrian Churches from whom we had it.* See the Hiſtory of it above.

2. *There was no more probability of the Syrian Churches loſing their tranſlation, than of the Weſtern Churches loſing their Greek copies.* For the ſame reaſon as the Greek copies did multiply, the Syriack ones would multiply too; and for the ſame reaſon that care would be taken to preſerve the one, care would be taken to preſerve the other. They were both eſteemed the Word of God, though in different languages; and in the nature of things it ſeems morally impoſſible, that the Churches of Antioch, Jeruſalem, &c. could ever loſe a treaſure of ſo much value, and which they ſo much eſteemed, as they did theſe ſacred writings. Add to this, that the Jewiſh Targums made about this time were ſafely preſerved; and the Chriſtians cannot, with any reaſon, be ſuppoſed leſs careful of their ſacred books than the Jews.

3. *There are internal characters in the tranſlation itſelf, which evidence its very great antiquity,* or its being made near that period which I have aſſigned it: for inſtance,

I. *The firſt inſtance* in the Syriack verſion which I propoſe as proving that antiquity of it, which I contend for, *is the tranſlation of the name Ptolemais, as it is in our Greek copies,* Act xxi. 7. by the name ܥܟܘ *Acu,* or *Aco*; for it may as juſtly, or indeed more juſtly, be pointed with the vowel Dſekopho, than Ezozo.

Now to make out what I deſign, I obſerve the moſt antient name of this place among the Iſraelites was עכו Aco, or Acco,

Judg. i. 31. This name undoubtedly continued long in uſe, and afterwards changed into Ptolemais; though at what time, or on what occaſion, I cannot certainly tell. Mr. Reiland [m], and after him Dean Prideaux [n], ſay it was repaired by Ptolemy Philadelphus, and from him had its new name Ptolemais. This was about 250 years before Chriſt; and ſeems a very probable account; I ſay probable only, becauſe I know not what antient author relates it. However this be, it is certain, the former name was antiquated and out of uſe among the Romans, and they called it Ptolemais. So we find by Pliny [o], *Ptolemais Claudii Cæſaris colonia quæ quondam Ace*; and Stephanus Περὶ πόλεων: Πτολεμαὶς, πόλις Φοινίκης, ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ πρότερον Ἀκή [p]: *Ptolemais was formerly called Ace.* How the termination *o* ſhould change into *e*, is very eaſily accounted for; ſuch changes being common, when a word is taken out of one language into another [q].

Now why the Syriack interpreter ſhould tranſlate it Aco, and not retain Ptolemais, can be accounted for no other way, but by ſuppoſing the perſons, for whom his Verſion was made, were more acquainted with one name than the other. Upon any other ſuppoſition, it would have been abſurd for him to have changed it. I argue then hence, that this Verſion muſt be made either before, or very ſoon after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem; becauſe till that time one may ſuppoſe a people (viz. the Jews) to retain the old name Aco ſtill, out of a fondneſs, very predominant in that people, for its antiquity: but how they, or indeed any other part of Syria, could after the Roman conqueſt call it by a name different from the Romans, ſeems to me impoſſible to conceive. Beſides, *it was*, as Pliny ſays, *a Roman colony*, even in Claudius's reign, and therefore very remarkable; and ſo in conſequence muſt in thirty or forty years more (in which time the conqueſt alſo was) be much more known by the name Ptolemais, by which the Romans called it. To ſuppoſe therefore that this tranſlation, in which

[m] Palæſtin. Illuſtrat. l. 2. c. 7.
[n] Connect. of Hiſt. of the Old and New Teſtam. Par. 2. Book 2. p. 61.
[o] Natur. Hiſtor. l. 5. c. 19.
[p] Apud Fuller. Miſcell. Sacr. l. 4. c. 15.
[q] Vid. Fuller, l. 4. c. 2.

we

we meet with this old name inſtead of the new one, was made at any great diſtance of time after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, is to ſuppoſe the tranſlator acting quite contrary to the deſign of his tranſlation; and, inſtead of a name well known to all, to ſubſtitute an antiquated name, which could be known but to few. On the other hand, ſuppoſing it made about the period I aſſign, it was a very proper tranſlation, being made for thoſe, who were wont to call this place by this name, as indeed it appears out of the Talmud in many places the Jews in our Saviour's time were wont to do [r]. I only add farther, that Joſephus, though a Jew, both in his Hiſtory and Antiquities of the Jewiſh War, whenever his occaſion led him to mention this place, calls it as St. Luke does in the place above-cited in the Acts, Ptolemais, and never Ace, nor Aco [s]: unleſs perhaps where he is relating the hiſtory of the Iſraelites' firſt entrance into this country [t]; there indeed, as it was proper, in tranſcribing the hiſtory of the Iſraelites' poſſeſſions in Canaan, he mentions this city under the name of Ἀρκή, which undoubtedly ought to be read Ἀκκή, as one of the beſt of Engliſh criticks, Mr. Fuller [u], has conjectured and proved; though Bochart thinks the letter ρ ought not to be caſt away, and oppoſes Mr. Fuller herein [x].

II. The next argument for that antiquity of the Syriack Verſion, which I have aſſigned, I collect *from its tranſlation of the Greek words* Ἕλλην, Ἔθνη, Ἐθνικός, *and their adverbial derivatives* Ἑλληνιστὶ *and* Ἐθνικῶς. After a careful examination of all thoſe places in the original Greek, where either of theſe words occur, and a compariſon of them with the ſeveral tranſlations of them in the Syriack Verſion, there ſeems to me the moſt juſt reaſon to conclude,

1. That the author of this Verſion was one, who had been formerly a Jew.

2. That he lived either before, or not long after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem by Titus, and the diſperſion of the Jews.

[r] See Dr. Lightfoot's Centur. Chorograph. c. 64.

[s] Antiq. Jud. l. 13. c. 20, 21. & de Bell. Judaic. l. 2. c. 9. where he particularly deſcribes the place.

[t] Antiq. Jud. l. 5. c. 1.

[u] Miſcel. Sacr. l. 4. c. 15.

[x] Canaan. l. 2. c. 17. in fine.

Now

Now before theſe I muſt premiſe a few remarks concerning the meaning of thoſe Greek words in the writings of the New Teſtament.

(1.) *The word* Ἑλλην *in the New Teſtament is made uſe of by the writers of it to denote all the world beſides the Jews.* The word properly ſignified *a Greek*; but ever ſince the Grecian conqueſts by Alexander, the Greeks became the moſt noted people, and the Jews, who had but very little acquaintance with the world, *called all nations by their name.* Hence we find frequently the diſtinction of all mankind into Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας [y], into *Jews and Greeks*, or (as our tranſlators, regarding the ſenſe more than the words, do well enough render it) *Jews and Gentiles*: juſt as the antient Greeks divided all mankind into Ἕλληνας and Βαρβάρους [z]. But this remark is ſo obvious and well known, that I ſhall inſiſt no farther on it.

(2.) *The word* Ἔθνη *in the New Teſtament denotes in a peculiar ſenſe all nations beſides the Jews.* Thus the old Hebrews in their language diſtinguiſhed themſelves from all others, by calling them הגויים and העמים, i. e. *the nations.* It would be ſuperfluous to produce inſtances of this, there being ſcarce a page in the New Teſtament, where there are not one or more inſtances.

(3.) *In the ideas of both theſe words the Jews implied ſomething that was bad*; or, which is the ſame thing, *they looked upon all the world as profane, ſinners, unclean, &c.* They eſteemed themſelves as a peculiar people, privileged above all the world, only in covenant with God, and ſo only in hope of his favour; no names therefore were thought bad enough for the people of other countries; *uncircumciſed* and *reprobate of God* were with them ſynonymous terms; and they could ſay nothing of a perſon among themſelves that would ſound worſe, than to liken him to a man *of another nation.* This is ſufficiently evident out of the New Teſtament; for inſtance, when our Saviour ſpeaks of a reprobate abandoned perſon, unfit for

[y] Rom. i. 16. ii. 9. iii. 9. Act. xix. 10, 17. 1 Cor. i. 22. x. 32. Gal. iii. 28. and many other places.

[z] Thucyd. l. 1. §. 3. Not. 5. in Scholiis. Strab. l. 14. p. 977. Vid. et Rom. i. 14.

any

any communion, he ſays[a], *Let him be to you as an Heathen*; i. e. eſteem him as vile as you do thoſe of other nations, for ſo the word Ἐθνικὸς muſt ſignify; and he makes it more than once an argument to reſtrain his diſciples from a ſinful practice, becauſe the Ἔθνη, *the nations*, i. e. *the Heathens did ſo*[b]. But to ſay nothing more of a thing ſo well known, it is eaſy to ſee what notions the Jews had of all people beſides themſelves, as impure and unfit for converſation, from the hiſtory of St. Peter's Viſion, Acts x. For nothing leſs than a miracle would convince him of the lawfulneſs of his having any converſation with thoſe, whom they called the Ἕλληνας or Ἔθνη, i. e. *of any other country beſides his own*[c]. He held it, as he ſays, an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or to come unto one born in another country; the reaſon of which was, becauſe they judged them unclean, and were afraid of being polluted by them.

Now this premiſed concerning the uſe and meaning of theſe words in the New Teſtament, I come to conſider, how our Syriack tranſlator has rendered them.

1.) *The word* Ἕλλην, *by which the Jews denoted all the world beſides themſelves, the Syriack interpreter very often tranſlates by* ܥܠܡܝܐ *i. e. a profane, impious, ſinful perſon.* See John vii. 35. Acts xviii. 4, 17. Mar. vii. 26. In other places he tranſlates it ܐܪܡܝܐ i. e. *a Syrian, Aramæus.* So Acts xvi. 1, 3. xix. 10, 17. xx. 21. Rom. i. 16. ii. 9, 10. 1 Cor. i. 22, &c. x. 32. xii. 13. Gal. ii. 3, 14. iii. 28. Col. iii. 11. In other places ܚܕܝܐ i. e. *Gentiles.* John xii. 20. Acts xxi. 28. Rom. iii. 9.

2.) *The word* Ἐθνικὸς, *i. e. a man of another nation, he tranſlates* ܥܠܡܝܐ *i. e. profane or impious.* Matth. vi. 7. xviii. 17. Ἐθνικῶς, (which we tranſlate *after the manner of Gentiles*) Gal. ii. 14. he tranſlates ܐܪܡܝܐ i. e. *after the manner of the Syrians*; and ſo Ἔθνη, i. e. *Gentiles*, he renders commonly ܚܕܝܐ but very often ܥܠܡܝܐ i. e. *profane.* So Matt. x. 5. 1 Cor. v. 1. x. 20. xii. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 3.

[a] Matt. xviii. 17.
[b] Matt. vi. 7, and 32.
[c] Act. x. 28.

Now

Now from theſe tranſlations I argue,-

1. *That the tranſlator was one of the Jewiſh nation*; elſe it would have been impoſſible for him ſo exactly to have formed his Verſion to the Jewiſh notions. Who elſe would have taken every opportunity to have repreſented all the nations of the earth in ſuch a manner? Nay, indeed, who beſides could have thought of it, and ſo naturally formed himſelf into the Jewiſh way of ſpeaking? Is it likely any one but a Jew would call all the world *profane?* or can it be thought, that a man, not accuſtomed to give theſe characters, could have ſo readily on all occaſions have done it? But to put the matter out of doubt, I will ſingle out one of his words, viz. ܐܪܡܝܐ *Armojo*, which he moſt commonly uſes for Ἕλλην, as may be ſeen above. The word is the very ſame with the old Hebrew ארמי, which ſignified *a Syrian*, or *native of Syria*. Now to underſtand the reaſon of this appellation, viz. why *Gentile* and *Syrian*, or *profane*, were among the Jews ſynonymous terms; we muſt obſerve, that though they were a part of Syria, as the word is generally uſed by geographers, yet they did not look upon themſelves as ſuch, but always had a very contemptible opinion of the Syrians, as *being idolaters*. So we find in Onkelos's Chaldee Verſion ערל and ארמאי, i. e. *uncircumciſed* and *Syrian*, are uſed promiſcuouſly to denote any *foreigner* or *profane perſon*, Lev. xxv. 47. becauſe they were their neareſt neighbours and idolaters; and the firſt idolaters mentioned in Scripture were Syrians, viz. Thare, Nachor, and Laban[d]; perhaps alſo becauſe when the Iſraelites were taught to humble themſelves before God, in their form of confeſſion, were theſe words, *Our father was a Syrian ready to periſh*[e]. Thus it came to paſs, that the word *Syrian* among the Jews denoted *a profane perſon*, or *an idolater*, as the word Ἕλλην did, when they wrote in Greek; and accordingly in the New Teſtament[f] the Syrian woman is called Ἑλληνίς. Now the Syriack interpreter uſing the word *Syrian* for *a Gentile* or *profane* perſon, evidences that him-

[d] Bochart. Phaleg. l. 2. c. 5. Camero Myrothec. ad Matth. xviii. 17.
[e] Deut. xxvi. 5.
[f] Mark vii. 26. Vid. omnin. Joan.

ſelf

ſelf was certainly a Jew; for to no other nation could thoſe words, *Greek* and *Syrian*, be ſynonymouſly and promiſcuouſly uſed for *Idolaters* or *Heathens*.

2. *As this tranſlator was a Jew, ſo from the tranſlation of theſe words it ſeems evident, that he lived either before, or not long after the conqueſt of Jeruſalem.* For when the Jews were ſcattered abroad in the world, they who were become Chriſtians, ſuch as this interpreter muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed to be, could not but learn, that theſe diſtinctions were now to ceaſe, and as the Apoſtles taught them, *it was neither Jew nor Gentile, circumciſed nor uncircumciſed, but the new creature only, that was acceptable to God.* While their temple ſtood, and they continued together as a people, one may well ſuppoſe, that even a Chriſtianized Jew would retain his former notions of all the reſt of the world being profane; and indeed this was really fact, as to a great part of the convert Jews, and the beſt reaſon that can be aſſigned for the Syriack tranſlation of the forementioned words. But afterwards they could not but ſee, I mean thoſe of them who embraced Chriſtianity, that, as Chriſt had foretold, their former differences were to be laid aſide, no perſons to be reckoned common and unclean, all ſincere perſons, of whatever country, were equally acceptable to God, &c. and in conſequence of this, their old denominations muſt ceaſe; and ſo this Verſion be made either before, or ſoon after their diſperſion.

Nor can it be objected, that the Syriack interpreter knew no other words, whereby to tranſlate the abovementioned Greek ones; for, it is certain, that he not only knew others, but with a great deal of accuracy and juſtice has made uſe of them. Thus when the word Ἕλλην in the New Teſtament is put to denote thoſe, who were properly Grecians, or inhabitants of Greece, he makes uſe of the word ܝܘܢܝܐ i. e. Ἰωνὶς, or Ἰωνικὸς, *a Greek*, properly ſo called. So when Paul, according to the forementioned diſtinction of the Greeks, divides all mankind into Ἕλληνας and Βαρβάρους, he uſes the word ܝܘܢܝܐ Rom. i. 14. and in another place, where he thought the ſame diſtinction was made, viz. Col. iii. 11. he uſes

uſes the ſame word. So when he means the proper natives of Greece, he calls them ܝܘܢܝܐ Acts xiv. 1. xvii. 4, 12, &c. and the Greek language he always ſtyles ܝܘܢܝܬܐ as Luke xxiii. 38. John xix. 20. Acts ix. 29. xxi. 37. This is a moſt convincing argument, that where he tranſlates the word Ἕλλην, *profane*, he ſpake according to the notions and language of the Jews; and therefore that he lived in the time above-mentioned.

CHAP. XVIII.

The Syriack Tranſlation is of the greateſt Antiquity, becauſe there is a moſt remarkable Agreement between it and our moſt antient Greek Manuſcripts of the New Teſtament.

I HAVE in the foregoing chapter produced two ſeveral inſtances, or arguments, out of the Syriack Verſion, which evidence its antiquity. The only one I ſhall mention farther is,

III. *Its agreement with the beſt and moſt antient copies of the New Teſtament.* This, though perhaps it will not prove it to be of that age I contend for, will at leaſt prove it of very great antiquity. He who will read Beza's larger Annotations on the New Teſtament, will frequently obſerve, that the Syriack tranſlation and his famous manuſcript, undoubtedly the oldeſt now in the world (which he gave to the Univerſity of Cambridge), do in many things agree, where they both differ from others. The ſame may be ſaid of ſeveral other antient copies. I ſhall omit inſtances, which any one may eaſily collect, and only eſtabliſh farther its antiquity, by conſidering the omiſſion of ſome things, which are found in all our printed copies; firſt premiſing, that I do not here determine any thing concerning thoſe paſſages, the Syriack Verſion being liable to the ſame corruptions as the Greek copies. This premiſed, I obſerve,

1. *That*

1. *That our preſent Syriack Verſion has not the hiſtory of the adulterous woman*, John viii. It is indeed inſerted in our Engliſh Polyglots, out of a manuſcript of Archbiſhop Uſher's, and afterwards by Schaaf from thence put into his late edition in Holland, but was wanting in the old Syriack copy. And ſo we find in many of the moſt antient Greek manuſcripts, and not mentioned by many of the oldeſt Chriſtian writers. Moſt of Beza's manuſcripts indeed had it[g]; but of a great number which Maldonate conſulted[h], but one had it. Eraſmus ſays[i], it was wanting in moſt of the Greek copies, but inſerted at the end of ſome of them. In the *Greek Catena of twenty three antient Fathers* on John, not one had it[k]. Neither Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Chryſoſtom, Nonnus (who wrote a Paraphraſe on John), nor Theophylact, &c. make any mention of it[l]. Father Simon ſaw many old manuſcripts in France, which had it not, only ſome of them at the end[m]. I need cite no more; it is plain, it was formerly wanting in many copies, which, with what has been ſaid above, ſeems to be a good argument of the antiquity of the Syriack Verſion.

2. *The Verſion has not the famous controverted Text*, 1 John v. 7. The late Dutch editor has unfairly inſerted it in the text, though he knew it was in no manuſcript, and that what he inſerted was only Tremellius's tranſlation out of Greek[n]. As the former verſes, ſo this alſo is wanting in almoſt all the antient manuſcripts, and is not cited by any of the antient writers againſt the Arians in the fourth century, nor even in the Council of Nice; though ſome ſuppoſe it was made uſe of by Cyprian before that time[o]. But this is a well-known ſubject. I only infer, that the want of this Text in the very oldeſt manuſcripts, proves the great antiquity of the Syriack Verſion.

[g] Annot. in Joan. vii. 53.
[h] Comment. in Joan. viii. apud Simon. Critic. Hiſt. of the N. Teſt. Par. 1. c. 13.
[i] Annot. in loc.
[k] Vid. Simon. loc. cit.
[l] Bez. loc. cit.
[m] Simon. loc. cit.
[n] Var. Lect. ad Calc. Teſt. Syriac.
[o] Father Simon's Critic. Hiſt. of the New Teſt. Par. 1. c. 18.

3. *The*

3. *The old Syriack Verſion has not in it the four Catholick Epiſtles*, (viz. the ſecond of Peter, the ſecond and third of John, and the Epiſtle of Jude) *nor the Revelation.* It is true, theſe are added in the laſt printed editions, as I have obſerved above, but were wanting in the old manuſcripts, which I take to be a very conſiderable proof of the antiquity of the Verſion; for their being wanting muſt neceſſarily proceed from one of theſe three cauſes, viz. either,

1.) Becauſe they were not written, when this Verſion was made; or,

2.) Becauſe the knowledge of them was not yet come to the Syrian Churches, for whom this tranſlation was made; or,

3.) Becauſe they were not yet univerſally received into the number of Canonical books.

Now whichſoever of theſe be ſaid, the antiquity of the Verſion will be ſufficiently eſtabliſhed. But the firſt of theſe ſeems moſt probable; becauſe, as I ſhall hereafter ſhew, the Churches of Syria did both know and receive ſeveral of theſe books at leaſt as Canonical in the ſecond century, as it is certain they do now [p], though it ſeems they are not ordinarily bound with the others in the ſame volume, and read in their Churches; a very probable reaſon of which the reader may ſee in Mr. Richardſon's Anſwer to Toland's Amyntor [q]. Until therefore any thing more probable can be ſaid on the contrary, which I dare ſay has not yet been done, I think it fair to conclude, that the four Canonical Epiſtles abovementioned not being in the old Syriack copies of the New Teſtament, evidences this Verſion was made before they were written. This argument was thought ſo concluſive by Tremellius [r], and our learned Biſhop Walton [s], that from it they were perſuaded to believe this Verſion was made in the Apoſtles' time.

Thus have I largely endeavoured to evince the antiquity of the Syriack Verſion; from which how evidently the truth

[p] So Guido Fabritius aſſures us, Præf. in Verſ. Lat. Syr. Teſt.

[q] Page 18.

[r] Præf. in Nov. Teſt. Syr.

[s] Proleg. in Bib. Polyglott. xiii. §. 15.

of

of my Propoſition follows, every one muſt ſee at once: viz. how much it confirms the Canonical authority of any book, that it is found there, and how much it contributes towards ſettling the true number of Canonical books.

CHAP. XIX.

Some Objections againſt the Antiquity of the Syriack Tranſlation anſwered.

IT may perhaps be judged neceſſary, that, before I leave this ſubject, I ſhould give the reader ſome account of what has been ſaid contrary to my hypotheſis of the age of this Verſion; though I proteſt ſeriouſly, I know not myſelf, nor have yet met with any thing, that can with any force be objected. But to omit nothing in a matter of ſuch conſequence, I will propoſe all that I know has been, or can be objected.

1. *Mr. Walter, a learned Biſhop in Germany*[t], *though he allow this Verſion* (what he calls *omnem laudem antiquitatis*) *the greateſt antiquity, is afraid to ſuppoſe it made either by the Apoſtles, or in their time, or even in the times immediately ſucceeding them*; becauſe, ſays he, then it would be of divine authority.

But nothing can be more weak than this; for,

(1.) *It does not at all follow, that it muſt be of divine authority, becauſe it was made by ſome honeſt Chriſtian in their time*; unleſs we ſuppoſe every writer of their time under the conduct of inſpiration: much leſs does it follow, that it muſt be divine, becauſe it was wrote by a perſon immediately after their time; for if ſo, then the writings of Papias, one of the weakeſt of authors, the writings attributed to Ignatius, Clemens, or any one, who had the good fortune to be born then, muſt have been divine. But,

[t] Officin. Bibl. §. 345.

(2.) If there were arguments ſufficient to prove it made by the Apoſtles, which is ſuppoſed in his reaſoning, *I cannot ſee this ſhould be any reaſon for our not believing it to be ſo*; viz. becauſe then it would have divine authority; for by the ſame reaſon we may reject any one of thoſe books, which are certainly known to be theirs.

2. *He farther urges, that it is not mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Euſebius, Athanaſius, Theophilus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Cyril, Theodoret, &c. who wrote in Syria or Egypt.* To which it will be ſufficient to anſwer, that moſt of them, if not all, were ignorant of the language, and ſo could not cite it, or had no occaſion to cite it; which I may ſafely aſſert, till it is proved that they had. But, if my memory do not fail me, Biſhop Walton, in his XIII. Prolegom. before the Polyglot, ſhews, that Chryſoſtom did cite it in his Homily on Heb. xiii.

3. *Mr. Du Pin ſuppoſes it made in the fifth or ſixth century, becauſe of the addition to the Lord's Prayer, viz. the Doxology, and the word Euchariſt is put there inſtead of Bread, which,* ſays he, *does not ſavour much of antiquity* [v]. The firſt of theſe ſhall be conſidered preſently; the laſt of theſe objections, viz. about the word *Euchariſt*, is founded upon a very great miſtake, which one would wonder ſo great a maſter of antiquity ſhould be found guilty of; for, to mention no others, I have obſerved the word Εὐχαριστία ſeveral times in this ſenſe in no later a writer than Juſtin Martyr [x], who, as has been proved, lived very near the Apoſtles' time. Nor indeed is it at all ſtrange the word ſhould have been thus early uſed, when we conſider, that the original of it was the Apoſtles' uſing the verb Εὐχαριστέω to denote our Lord's action in celebrating this ordinance [y].

4. *Grotius* [z] *(as well as Du Pin) imagines this Verſion made after the uſe of Liturgies came into the Church; becauſe*

[v] Hiſt. of the Canon of the New Teſt. c. 4. §. 2.

[x] Apol. 2. pro Chriſt. p. 97, 98. & Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 260, 261.

[y] See Matt. xxvi. 27. Luk. xxii. 19.

[z] Annot. in Matt. vi. 13.

in

in it, at the end of the Lord's Prayer, we read the Doxology[a], For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever; *which, not being to be found in the moſt antient Greek copies, they conclude was put into them after the uſe of Liturgies, and this Verſion made out of ſuch a copy.*

This objection, I confeſs, appears very plauſible; but the force of it will be eaſily taken away, if it appear,

(1.) That the Doxology is as old as the Prayer itſelf.

(2.) If we conſider, that we may as eaſily ſuppoſe this paſſage, if it be at all an interpolation, inſerted into the Syriack Verſion, as into the Greek copies.

(1.) *The Doxology ſeems to be as old as the Prayer itſelf:* for,

1.) *It is certainly in the beſt, moſt antient, and almoſt all the Greek manuſcripts in the world.* Eraſmus, though he diſputes againſt the paſſage[b], acknowledges he found it *in all the Greek copies:* and Brugenſis aſſures us, *it was extant in all, except one manuſcript at Paris*[c].

2.) *Chryſoſtom, Euthymius, Theophylact, and others of the Greek Fathers, read the paſſage*[d].

3.) *It appears manifeſtly cited by Clemens Romanus twice, in the end of his firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians*[e].

4.) *The genuineneſs of the paſſage ſeems to me fully demonſtrated by that excellent obſervation of the moſt ingenious and truly learned Mr. Gregory*[f], *out of Lucian's Philopatris.* That merry writer having been ridiculing, according to his cuſtom, the Chriſtian Religion and doctrines (particularly the doctrine of the Trinity, *that three ſhould be one, and one three, &c.*) in the end of the dialogue has theſe words: *Say no more of thoſe people, but begin your prayer with* [the word] *Father, and end it with the famous Hymn*[g]. By this it is evi-

[a] Matt. vi. 13.
[b] Annot. in loc.
[c] Apud Glaſſ. Philol. Sacr. l. 1. Tract. 2. §. 2.
[d] Glaſſ. loc. cit.
[e] On voit de ſemblables Doxologies dans l'Epître de Saint Clement aux Corinthiens. Le Clerc in N. Teſt. Gallic. ad loc.
[f] See his Works, c. 38.
[g] Ὥστε ἔασον τάτες, τὴν εὐχὴν ἀπὸ Πατρὸς ἀρξάμενος καὶ τὴν πολωνύμου ᾠδὴν εἰς τέλος ἐπιθείς. Lucian. Philopatr. juxt. finem.

dent he muſt intend what we call the Lord's Prayer; and if ſo, then the πολυώνυμος ᾠδὴ can mean nothing but the Doxology, and if ſo, the teſtimony is beyond exception, that the clauſe was annexed to the Prayer in Trajan's, or at leaſt Marcus Antoninus's time.

5.) It is farther urged by the ſame incomparable Mr. Gregory, that *our Lord gathered his Form of Prayer out of the tradition of the Elders, i. e. the Jewiſh prayers*, and that *this Doxology was among them.* This he proves, by producing the Jewiſh prayers at length out of their books, which is more fully done by Dr. Lightfoot[h], Druſius[i], and Capellus[k]. Now hence it follows, the Doxology muſt be as old as the Prayer; though I muſt own, I am apt to ſuſpect, that though the words of our Lord's Prayer are in the Jewiſh Euchologies, yet that theſe were taken from the Chriſtians, rather than the contrary. Nevertheleſs, they are of antiquity ſufficient to prove the point in hand.

I cannot therefore but blame the raſhneſs of Eraſmus[l], Beza[m], and others, who have upon ſlight grounds juſtled this paſſage out of Scripture, and reckoned it *a trifling addition to the text*, as Eraſmus in ſo many words calls it. All that I know can be objected is, that *it is not at the end of this Prayer in Luke, nor in the oldeſt Latin copies, nor cited by the Latin Fathers*; for anſwer to which I ſhall only refer the reader to what is above ſaid, to Glaſſius's Diſſertation on this ſubject[n], and Dr. Whitby's Examen of Dr. Mills' Various Lections[o].

I conclude then, that this Doxology being as old as the Prayer itſelf, can be no argument againſt the antiquity of the Syriack Verſion. But,

(2.) Suppoſe the Doxology really an interpolation into the Greek copies, and not originally a part of the Prayer itſelf, *the antiquity of the Syriack Verſion will not be at all hurt hereby.* It is true, the Liturgies and Forms of prayer, as this objection of Grotius, Du Pin, and, as I find ſince, of Dr. Mills,

[h] Hor. Heb. in Matt. vi. 7—13.
[i] Præterit. in loc.
[k] Spicileg. in loc.
[l] Annot. in loc.
[m] Loc. jam cit.
[n] Philol. Sacr.
[o] Lib. 2. cap. 1. §. 1.

ſuppoſes,

ſuppoſes, were of late uſe in the Church; and if the Syriack tranſlation was made after theſe, I am ready to grant, what theſe gentlemen contend for, that it was not made near the Apoſtles' time. But let the uſe of Liturgies be as late as they pleaſe, and the interpolation of the Doxology even after them; yet, I ſay, it does not follow, that the Syriack Verſion was made after, *becauſe we may as well ſuppoſe an interpolation of the Syriack, as the Greek text.* I have the pleaſure in this thought to join with Father Simon [p], who well argues thus: *No argument*, ſays he, *can be weaker than this is againſt the antiquity of the Syriack Verſion. If this addition was inſerted into the Greek copies, why may not the ſame thing be affirmed of the Syriack Verſion, which might be reviſed or altered in that place conformable to the Greek copies; eſpecially ſince the Syrian Churches had their Liturgies from the Greeks?*

Thus does not this objection any way detract from the antiquity of the Syriack Verſion, nor contradict the truth of my hypotheſis, that it was made in or near the Apoſtles' time; of which I ſhall ſay now no more, but leave the ſubject with one or two, which ſeem to me important, Corollaries.

Coroll. 1. *The antiquity of the Syriack Verſion wonderfully confirms the purity and incorruption of the printed copies of the New Teſtament.* The connection of this is the agreement there is between them both; and this is not only very great, but even ſurpriſing to one who conſiders, that our preſent Greek was compiled according to the judgment and diſcretion of one ſingle perſon, out of a great number of differing manuſcripts. That there is ſuch an agreement, I aver upon a long and cloſe obſervation. Now that this agreement ſhould be, and the places in which they agree be corrupted, is the moſt abſurd ſuppoſition imaginable. Each muſt prove the other to be genuine; unleſs we can ſuppoſe a combination in the Churches of the Eaſt and Weſt to corrupt their copies in the ſame places, without any reaſon in the world.

[p] Critic. Hiſt. N. Teſt. Par. I. c. 13.

Coroll. II. *The Syriack Verſion is of very great ſervice in explaining many paſſages in the New Teſtament.* He who will conſider, that this was the language, which our Saviour and his Apoſtles ſpake to each other, the idiom of which is preſerved in the ſacred writings; he who believes this interpreter to have lived among thoſe who ſpake this language, and to have known himſelf the cuſtoms referred to in our Saviour's and his Apoſtles' diſcourſes, muſt needs conclude him a very good guide in the explication of them. I will not produce any inſtances here, it being not directly to my purpoſe; but do venture to ſay, that very many of the moſt obſcure places in the New Teſtament are in this Verſion, by the ſkill of the tranſlator, and the idiom of the language, happily explained; and ſo explained, as perhaps there was no other way of coming at the true meaning of the text. This is commonly obſerved, and many inſtances of it are produced by Martini and others; and many more may be found in the writings of Caſaubon, Fuller, Spanheim the elder, De Dieu, and others. I wiſh this may be thought by any one an argument to incite him to the ſtudy of this language, and the New Teſtament in it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

An Alphabetical Table of all the Apocryphal Pieces not extant.

HAVING above produced the names of all the books, that may ſeem to lay any claim to Canonical authority, and which are now not extant, I ſhall finiſh this part with an alphabetical table of the ſame, with the ſeveral places where they are mentioned, that ſo the reader may at one view, and with more eaſe, ſee how great their number is, and how frequently they are mentioned by the antient writers of Chriſtianity.

A.

1. The Acts of Andrew. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 25. *Philaſtr. Hæreſ.* 87. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 47. §. 1. *Hæreſ.* 61. §. 1. *& Hæreſ.* 63. §. 2. *Gelaſ. in Decret.* *

2. Books under the name of Andrew. *Auguſt. contr. Adverſar. Leg. & Prophet. l.* 1. *c.* 20. *et Innocent. I. Epiſt.* 3. *ad Exuper. Tholoſ. Epiſc.* §. 7.

3. The Goſpel of Andrew. *Gelaſ. in Decret.*

A Goſpel under the name of Apelles. *Hieron. Præfat. in Comment. in Matth.*

The Goſpel according to the Twelve Apoſtles. *Origen. Homil. in Luc.* i. 1. *Ambroſ. Comment. in Luc.* i. 1. *et Hieron. Præfat. in Comment. in Matth.*

B.

The Goſpel of Barnabas. *Gelaſ. in Decret.*

1. The Writings of Bartholomew the Apoſtle. *Dionyſ. Areopagit. de Theol. Myſt. c.* 1.

2. The Goſpel of Bartholomew. *Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccleſ. in Pantæn. & Præfat. in Comm. in Matth. Gelaſ. in Decret.*

The Goſpel of Baſilides. *Orig. in Luc.* i. 1. *Ambroſ. in Luc.* i. 1. *Hieron. Præfat. in Comm. in Matth.*

* Apud Concil. Sanct. Tom. 4. p. 1260.

C.

1. The Goſpel of Cerinthus. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 51. §. 7.

2. The Revelation of Cerinthus. *Caius Preſb. Rom. lib. Diſput. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 28.

1. An Epiſtle of Chriſt to Peter and Paul. *Auguſt. de Conſenſ. Evang. l.* 1. *c.* 9, 10.

2. Some other Books under the name of Chriſt. *Ibid. c.* 3.

3. An Epiſtle of Chriſt, produced by the Manichees. *Auguſt. contr. Fauſt. l.* 28. *c.* 4.

4. A Hymn, which Chriſt taught his Diſciples. *Epiſt. ad Ceret. Epiſc.*

E.

The Goſpel according to the Egyptians. *Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 3. *p.* 452, 465. *Origen. in Luc.* i. 1. *Hieron. Præf. in Comm. in Matth. Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 62. §. 2.

The Acts of the Apoſtles, made uſe of by the Ebionites. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 30. §. 16.

The Goſpel of the Ebionites. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 30. §. 13.

The Goſpel of the Encratites. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 46. §. 1.

The Goſpel of Eve. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 26. §. 2.

H.

The Goſpel according to the Hebrews. *Hegeſipp. lib. Comment. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 4. *c.* 22. *Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 2. *p.* 380. *Origen. Tract.* 8. *in Matth.* xix. 19. *& lib.* 2. *in Joan. p.* 58. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 25, 27, *et* 39. Jerome in many places, as above.

The Book of the Helkeſaites. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 6. *c.* 38.

The falſe Goſpels of Heſychius. *Hieron. Præfat. in Evang. ad Damaſ. Gelaſ. in Decret.*

J.

1. The Book of James. *Origen. Comm. in Matth.* xiii. 55, 56.

2. Books forged and publiſhed under the name of James. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 30. §. 23. *Innocent. I. Epiſt.* 3. *ad Exuper. Tholoſ. Epiſc.* §. 7.

1. The

1. The Acts of John. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 25. *Athanaſ. in Synopſ.* §. 76. *Philaſtr. Hæreſ.* 87. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 47. §. 1. *Auguſt. contr. Adverſ. Leg. l.* 1. *c.* 20.

2. Books under the name of John. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 30. §. 23. *et Innocent. I. ibid.*

A Goſpel under the name of Jude. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 38. §. 1.

A Goſpel under the name of Judas Iſcariot. *Iren. adverſ. Hæreſ. l.* 1. *c.* 35.

L.

The Acts of the Apoſtles by Leucius. *Auguſt. lib. de Fide contr. Manich. c.* 38.

The Acts of the Apoſtles by Lentitius. *Auguſt. de Act. cum Fœlic. Manich. l.* 2. *c.* 6.

The Acts under the Apoſtles' name by Leontius. *Auguſt. de Fide contr. Manich. c.* 5.

The Acts of the Apoſtles by Leuthon. *Hieron. Epiſt. ad Chromat. & Heliodor.*

The Books of Lentitius. *Gelaſ. in Decret.*

The falſe Goſpels, publiſhed by Lucianus. *Hieron. Præfat. in Evang. ad Damaſ.*

M

Books under the name of Matthew. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 30. §. 23.

1. The Goſpel of Matthias. *Orig. Comm. in Luc.* i. 1. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 25. *Ambroſ. in Luc.* i. 1. *Hieron. Præfat. in Comment. in Matth.*

2. The Traditions of Matthias. *Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 2. *p.* 380. *l.* 3. *p.* 436. *& l.* 7. p. 748.

3. A Book under the name of Matthias. *Innocent I. ibid.*

The Acts of the Apoſtles uſed by the Manichees. *Auguſt. lib. cont. Adimant. Manich. c.* 17.

The Goſpel of Marcion. *Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib.* 4. *c.* 2. *&* 4. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 42. *Procem.*

The Goſpel of Merinthus. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 51. §. 7.

The

N.

The Gospel according to the Nazarenes. See above concerning the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

P.

The Gospel of Perfection. *Epiphan. Hæres.* 26. §. 2.

1. The Acts of Paul and Thecla. *Tertull. de Baptism. c.* 17. *Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccl. in Luc. Gelas. in Decret.*

2. The Acts of Paul. *Orig. de Princip. l.* 1. *c.* 2. & *lib.* 21. *in Joan. Tom.* 2. *p.* 298. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l.* 3. c. 3. & 25. *Philastr. Hæres.* 87.

3. The Preaching of Paul (and Peter.) *Lactant. de Ver. Sap. l.* 4. *c.* 21. *Script. anonym. ad calcem Opp. Cypr.* and, according to some, *Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 6. *p.* 636.

4. A Book under the name of Paul. *Cyprian. Epist.* 27.

5. The Revelation of Paul. *Epiphan. Hæres.* 38. §. 2. *August. Tract.* 98. *in Joann. in fin. Gelas. in Decret.*

1. The Acts of Peter. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *Athanas. in Synops. S. Scriptur.* §. 76. *Philastr. Hæres.* 87. *Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccl. in Petr. Epiphan. Hæres.* 30. §. 15.

2. The Doctrine of Peter. *Orig. Procem. in libr. de Princip.*

3. The Gospel of Peter. *Serap. lib. de Evang. Petri apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l.* 6. *c.* 12. *Tertull. adv. Marc. l.* 4. *c.* 5. *Orig. Comment. in Matt.* xiii. 55, 56. *Tom. I. p.* 223. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 3. & 25. *Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccles. in Petr.*

4. The Judgment of Peter. *Ruffin. Exposit. in Symbol. Apostol.* §. 36. *Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccles. in Petr.*

5. The Preaching of Peter. *Heracl. apud Orig. l.* 14. *in Joan. Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 1. *p.* 357. *l.* 2. *p.* 390. *l.* 6. *p.* 635, 636, & 678. *Theodot. Byzant. in Excerpt. p.* 809. *ad calc. Opp. Clem. Alex. Lactant. de Ver. Sap. l.* 4. *c.* 21. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *et Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccles. in Petr.*

6. The Revelation of Peter. *Clem. Alex. lib. Hypotypos. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l.* 6. *c.* 14. *Theodot. Byzant. in Excerpt.*

Excerpt. p. 806, 807. *ad calc. Opp. Clem. Alex. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *&* 25. *Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccl. in Petr.*

7. Books under the name of Peter. *Innocent. I. Epiſt.* 3. *ad Exuper. Tholoſ. Epiſc.* §. 7.

1. The Acts of Philip. *Gelaſ. in Decret.*

2. The Goſpel of Philip. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 26. §. 13.

S.

The Goſpel of Scythianus. *Cyrill. Catech. VI.* §. 22. *& Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 66. §. 2.

The Acts of the Apoſtles by Seleucus. *Hieron. Epiſt. ad Chromat. & Heliodor.*

The Revelation of Stephen. *Gelaſ. in Decret.*

T.

The Goſpel of Tatian. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 4. *c.* 29.

The Goſpel of Thaddæus. *Gelaſ. in Decret.*

The Catholick Epiſtle of Themiſon. *Apollon. lib. cont. Cataphryg. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 5. *c.* 18.

The Goſpel of Truth. *Iren. adv. Hæreſ. l.* 3. *c.* 11.

1. The Acts of Thomas. *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 47. §. 1. *&* 61. §. 1. *Athanaſ. in Synopſ. S. Script.* §. 76. *& Gelaſ. in Decret.*

2. The Goſpel of Thomas. *Orig. in Luc.* i. 1. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 25. *Cyrill. Catech. IV.* §. 36. *et Catech. VI.* §. 31. *Ambroſ. in Luc.* i. 1. *Athan. in Synopſ. S. Script.* §. 76. *Hieron. Præf. in Comment. in Matth. Gelaſ. in Decret.*

3. The Revelation of Thomas. *Gelaſ. in Decret.*

4. Books under the name of Thomas. *Innocent. I. Epiſt.* 3. *ad Exuper. Tholoſ. Epiſc.* §. 7.

V.

The Goſpel of Valentinus. *Tertull. de Præſcript. adv. Hæret. c.* 49.

A METHOD

A

METHOD

FOR

SETTLING THE CANON

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

PART II.

CHAP. I.

The Deſign of the Second Part. Some general Obſervations premiſed. That ſeveral Titles were given formerly to one Book. That ſeveral of the Apocryphal Books were made out of our preſent Canonical Books. That no Apocryphal Books have been ever appealed to by the Chriſtians as of Authority.

HAVING, in the preceding Part of this volume, endeavoured to make *a complete enumeration of all the loſt Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament*, and laid down ſeveral *Propoſitions*, by which they may be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe, which are *truly Canonical*; I proceed in this Part to make *a particular and critical enquiry into each of theſe books*, and, by an application of the abovementioned rules, to demonſtrate, that *no one of them ever was, or ought to be, reputed of the Canon*;

Canon; withal producing *every fragment, and every thing elſe that is ſaid concerning them by any Chriſtian writer, or writers of the firſt four centuries after Chriſt.*

But, before I enter upon this work, I think it neceſſary to premiſe a few Obſervations, which may be ſerviceable to give light to the whole; viz.

OBSERV. I.

That ſeveral of the different Titles in the preceding Catalogue of loſt Books, belonged to one and the ſame Book.

So it frequently happened, that many of thoſe pieces which appear either to have been entirely the ſame, or very little different, paſſed under two, or three, or more different denominations. Thus *the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, the Goſpel according to the Nazarenes, the Goſpel of the Ebionites, the Goſpel according to the Twelve Apoſtles, the Goſpel of Cerinthus, the Goſpel of Bartholomew,* ſeem to have been the different names of the ſame Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew, in ſome places perhaps altered and interpolated. So alſo *the Acts* under the titles *of Leucius, Lentitius, Leontius, Leuthon, Seleucus, the Acts of the Apoſtles made uſe of by the Manichees,* and ſeveral other titles, denoted only one ſpurious book, which was the forgery of Leucius Charinus. In like manner, *the Revelation* and *Anabaticon of Paul* were one book; *the Preaching of Peter* and *Paul* one book, and the ſame with *the Doctrine of Peter* and ſeveral others.

Nor can it be thought ſtrange, that this variety of denominations ſhould have happened to thoſe books; ſince we find the very ſame thing to have happened to ſome of thoſe books, which are now received into the Canon of the New Teſtament. *The Goſpel*, for inſtance, *which now goes under the name of Mark, was formerly aſcribed to Peter, and called his*, as we are informed both by Tertullian [a] and Jerome [b]. And

[a] Evangelium quod Marcus edidit, Petri affirmatur. Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5.

[b] Evangelium juxta Marcum, qui auditor Petri et interpres fuit, *hujus* dicitur. Catal. Script. Eccleſ. in Petr. See below, chap. xxxi. N°. I.

the

the Goſpel which we now call St. Luke's, formerly went under the name of St. Paul, as we are expreſsly aſſured by the former of thoſe antient writers [c], inſomuch that it was a prevailing opinion among the primitive Chriſtians, that when St. Paul in his Epiſtles expreſſes himſelf thus, *According to my Goſpel*, which he ſeveral times doth [d], he meant the Goſpel of St. Luke. So Euſebius [e], Jerome [f], and others.

If it be enquired, whence this variety of denominations proceeded, I aſſign the following reaſons; viz.

1. *The uncertainty perſons were under as to the author of the book.* This ſeems to have been the caſe in reſpect of the various titles of Luke and Mark's Goſpels.

2. *The various denominations of the heretics*, who made uſe of the ſame book, *occaſioned its having a different title.* For inſtance, hence it came to paſs that the Hebrew Goſpel was ſometimes called *the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, and ſometimes *the Goſpel of the Ebionites*: And,

3. *Becauſe it was not cuſtomary for the authors of thoſe times to affix titles to their works*; and ſo their works being diſperſed into different countries, ſome made uſe of one denomination, which they thought moſt ſuitable to the deſign of the book, others of another. Thus, for inſtance, the book which was by ſome called *the Preaching, i. e. Sermons, of Peter*, was by others called *the Doctrine of Peter.*

OBSERV. II.

Several of the Books of the Catalogue were compiled out of thoſe Books which are now received into the Canon of the New Teſtament.

IT appeared to the heretics of thoſe times a very probable, as indeed in the event it proved a very ſucceſsful, method,

[c] Tertull. loc. jam cit.

[d] Rom. ii. 16. xvi. 25. See alſo Gal. i. 8. 2 Theſſ. ii. 14.

[e] Φασὶ δὲ ὡς ἄρα τὸ καθ' αὐτὸν (Lucam) εὐαγγέλιον μνημονεύειν ὁ Παῦλος εἴωθεν, ὁπηνίκα ὡς περὶ ἰδίου τινὸς εὐαγγελίου γράφων ἔλεγε, Κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 4.

[f] Quidam ſuſpicantur quotieſcunque in epiſtolis ſuis Paulus dicit, *juxta evangelium meum*, de Lucæ ſignificare volumine. Catal. Script. Eccleſ. in Luc.

to

to propagate their favourite notions under the name of ſome Apoſtle; this, they ſaw, would procure them much greater regard and eſteem, and this gave birth to moſt of theſe Apocryphal compoſures. But though ſome of them boldly ventured to prefix the Apoſtles' names to that *which was entirely their own compoſure*, others more artfully *mixed their own and ſome Apoſtle's writings together*, retaining only ſo much of his writing, as would enable them with the greater confidence to impoſe their ſpurious piece upon the world, *as really his*. Thus did the Nazarenes, Marcion, Heſychius, Lucianus, and others.

OBSERV. III.

No Chriſtian Writer hath appealed to, or made uſe of any of the Books of the preceding Catalogue (i. e. of the loſt Apocryphal Books of the New Teſtament) as of any Authority.

ALTHOUGH the proof of this Propoſition be the main buſineſs of the ſubſequent Part of this volume, yet I thought it neceſſary to premiſe *ſome general account* of this matter *here*, becauſe the main of the controverſy about the Canon of the New Teſtament does certainly depend upon this queſtion, viz. *What thoſe books are, which the primitive writers of Chriſtianity appealed to, as ſacred, in their writings*, or *after what manner they appealed to them?* Mr. Dodwell, Mr. Toland, and others, who have attempted to make the Canon of Scripture precarious and uncertain, principally inſiſt upon this, *That the preſent books of the Canon and others are indifferently and promiſcuouſly cited and appealed to in the moſt ancient records of the Chriſtian Religion.* And inaſmuch as ſeveral learned men have too unguardedly dropt expreſſions of the like nature, I thought it not improper to give the reader here the following general account of the *manner, in which theſe books are cited.* I aſſert then,

1. *That, for the moſt part, the Apocryphal books abovementioned are expreſsly, and in ſo many words, rejected by thoſe who have mentioned them, as the forgeries of heretics, and ſo as*

ſpurious

ſpurious and Apocryphal. This I aſſert (upon the cloſeſt and moſt impartial enquiry into all the places of their writings, where any of them are named) to be true as to almoſt every individual book.

2. When any book is cited, or ſeems to be appealed to by any Chriſtian writer, which is not expreſsly and in ſo many words rejected by him, *there are other ſufficient arguments to prove that he did not eſteem it to be Canonical.* Thus, for inſtance, though Origen in one or two places takes a paſſage out of the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, yet in another place he rejects it under the name of the Goſpel of the Twelve Apoſtles, as a book of the hereticks, and declares, *the Church received only four Goſpels* [g].

3. Sometimes the Fathers made uſe of the Apocryphal books *to ſhew their learning, or that the hereticks might not charge them with partiality and ignorance, as being acquainted only with their own books.* Remarkable to this purpoſe are thoſe words of Origen [h], *the Church receives only four Goſpels, the hereticks have many; ſuch as that of the Egyptians, Thomas, &c. Theſe we read, that we may not be eſteemed ignorant, and by reaſon of thoſe who imagine they know ſomething extraordinary, if they know the things contained in theſe books.* To the ſame purpoſe ſays Ambroſe [i]; having mentioned ſeveral of the Apocryphal books, he adds, *we read theſe, that they may not be read* (by others); *we read them, that we may not ſeem ignorant; we read them, not that we may receive them, but reject them, and may know what thoſe things are of which they* (hereticks) *make ſuch boaſting.*

4. Sometimes perhaps theſe books may be cited by the Fathers, *becauſe the perſons againſt whom they were writing did receive them, being willing to diſpute with them upon principles out of their own books*; though I believe there are no inſtances of this within my time.

[g] See below in this Part, Chap. 28.

[h] Legimus, ne quid ignorare videremur, propter eos qui ſe putant aliquid ſcire, ſi iſta cognoverint. Homil. in Luc. i. 1.

[i] Legimus, ne legantur; legimus, ne ignoremus; legimus non ut teneamus, ſed ut repudiemus, & ut ſciamus qualia ſint in quibus magnifici iſti cor exultant ſuum. Comment. in Luc. i. 1.

5. It may perhaps be true, that one or two writers have cited a few paſſages out of theſe books, *becauſe the fact they cited was not to be found in any other.* St. John tells us, chap. xxi. 25. that *our Lord did many other things, beſides thoſe which he had recorded; the which,* ſays he, *if they ſhould be written every one, I ſuppoſe the world itſelf could not contain the books which ſhould be written.* Some accounts of theſe actions and diſcourſes of Chriſt were unqueſtionably preſerved, and handed down to the ſecond century, or farther, by tradition, which though inſerted afterwards into the books of the hereticks, may be eaſily ſuppoſed to have been cited by ſome later writers, though at the ſame time they eſteemed the books which contained them uninſpired, and not of the Canon. This was the caſe as to Jerome's citing the Hebrew Goſpel, which he certainly looked upon as ſpurious and Apocryphal, as I ſhall hereafter prove.

CHAP. II.

A general Proof that no Book, once Canonical, is loſt, from the ordinary Conduct of Providence, the Zeal of the Chriſtians, and the early Diſperſion of the Sacred Books into moſt remote Countries. A conſiderable Objection anſwered.

OBSERV. IV.

No Book, which was once made or eſteemed to be Part of the Canon, is loſt.

BEFORE I enter upon the particular examination of the abovementioned Apocryphal books now loſt, it may be neceſſary to premiſe ſome general proof of this matter.

Every one who is acquainted with the writings of our firſt Reformers, muſt often have obſerved, that it was a queſtion very warmly diſputed between them and the advocates of the Roman Church, *whether any inſpired book, once received by the Church*

Church as a part of the Canon, is by any accident or injury of time loſt and periſhed? The Papiſts, contending always for the inſufficiency of our preſent revelation, thereby the better to ſupport their ridiculous ſentiments of the neceſſity of their pretended traditions, have generally determined in the affirmative, and would perſuade us, that *many of the moſt valuable parts of Scripture, both of the Old and New Teſtament, are now quite loſt.* Thus Bellarmine [a], Pineda [b], and many of the beſt writers among the Jeſuits. This opinion of the Papiſts, as it appears evidently calculated to ſerve a purpoſe, would be therefore leſs conſiderable, if many other learned men had not too unwarily eſpouſed it, for the ſake of avoiding ſome difficulties which they could not ſo eaſily ſolve without it. Hence we meet with it in the writings of Chryſoſtom [c], Theophylact [d], Calvin [e]; and even our learned Whitaker himſelf, on this very queſtion, allows [f], that ſome of thoſe books are now wanting, which were once conſtituent parts of the Canon of Scripture. This indeed is generally meant of ſome books of the Old Teſtament, though the Papiſts alſo aſſert it of the New [g]; I ſhall therefore, without entering largely into the controverſy, or ſearching the common places *of the perfection of the Scriptures*, offer only two or three reaſons, by which it will appear at leaſt probable, that *no ſacred and inſpired book is now wanting*; adding only ſome few remarks on what has been ſaid, which is moſt conſiderable, on the other ſide of the queſtion.

1. *It ſeems very diſagreeable to the ordinary conduct of divine Providence, to ſuffer a book wrote under the influences of the holy Spirit to be loſt.* It ſeems to be no ſmall reflection on the wiſdom of the divine Being, to ſay he firſt influenced the writing of a ſet of books (i. e. by his own extraordinary impreſſions on men's minds cauſed them to be written), and afterwards permitted them by chance, or the negligence of men,

[a] De verb. Dei, l. 4. c. 4.
[b] De rebus Salom. l. 1. c. 1. §. 8.
[c] Homil. 9. in Matth. ii.
[d] In Matth. ii. in fine.
[e] Vid. Calvin. Harm. Evang. in Matth. ii. 23.
[f] Controverſ. I. de Scriptur. Quæſt. VI. c. 9.
[g] Vid. Turretin. Inſtit. Theol. Loc. 2. Quæſt. 7. §. 3.

to be irrecoverably loſt. If they were not ſerviceable to inſtruct and direct mankind in the methods of attaining the great ends of being, why were they at firſt given? If they were, it ſeems hard to imagine, the ſame kind Providence that gave them, would again take them away. How high ſuch a charge as this doth riſe, both againſt the wiſdom and goodneſs of divine Providence, may eaſily be perceived by every one who will think impartially on the matter.

This arguing may be very much ſtrengthened, by conſidering *the great care which the divine Being in all ages took to preſerve thoſe books, which are now received into the Canon of the Old Teſtament*, even when the perſons with whom they were entruſted were under circumſtances, in which, without the influence of Heaven, it would have been almoſt impoſſible for them to have preſerved them. To inſtance only that one time when the Jews were under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes[h], when although that monſter of iniquity laid their temple and their city waſte, deſtroyed all the ſacred books he could meet with, and at length publiſhed a decree, that all thoſe ſhould ſuffer immediate death, who did not reſign their copies; yet was the ſacred volume ſafely preſerved, and taken care of by its author.

2. *The zeal of the faithful at all times for their ſacred books was ſuch, as would be a very effectual means to ſecure them from periſhing.* This is well known both of the Jews and Chriſtians; and indeed no leſs can be reaſonably imagined of thoſe, who looked upon theſe books as diſcovering the methods of obtaining eternal life, and that religion, for which they willingly ſacrificed both themſelves and all they had. Hence as under the barbarous perſecution of the Jews by Antiochus juſt mentioned, ſo under the Chriſtian perſecution no endeavours were wanting to extirpate and aboliſh the Scriptures. It is evident, the warm zeal and diligent care of the faithful preſerved them; and although the Emperor Dioclefian in his imperial edict, among other cruelties, enacted, that

[h] Ἡφανίζετο δὲ εἴ που βίβλος εὐρεθείη ἱερὰ, ἢ νόμος, ἢ παρ' οἷς ἐφεδρεύοι, ἢ ὅτοι κακοὶ, κακῶς ἀπόλοιτο. Joſeph. Antiq. Jud. lib. 12. c. 7. See alſo 1 Maccab. i. 56, 57.

all

all the ſacred books ſhould be burnt wherever they were found[i]; yet as the courage and reſolution of the Chriſtians baffled and fruſtrated the deſigns of his rage in all other inſtances, ſo very remarkably in this. Nor indeed could it well be otherwiſe, when we conſider,

3. *That the Canonical books were, not long after their publication, diſperſed into the moſt diſtant countries, and in the poſſeſſion of innumerable perſons.* The truth of this fact has been in ſome meaſure demonſtrated in the former Part of this work (Prop. II.) and the oppoſite opinion of Mr. Dodwell refuted (Corol. I. Prop. II.) I ſhall therefore take the fact now for granted, and only hence infer, how improbable it is, nay, almoſt impoſſible, that any book, ſo eſteemed as the Chriſtians muſt be ſuppoſed to eſteem thoſe books, which they imagined to be dictated by the Holy Ghoſt, ſo diffuſed into the moſt remote countries, the copies of which would alſo be continually multiplying and increaſing, could by any accident or chance, by any human force or power, or much leſs by any careleſs neglect, be loſt and irrecoverably periſh.

The moſt conſiderable, and indeed almoſt all the proof that has been attempted againſt this opinion is, *that there are ſome books mentioned, and others referred to both in the Old and New Teſtament, which ſeem to have been compoſed by prophets and inſpired authors, and ſo of conſequence Canonical, which are now entirely and irrecoverably loſt.* Among theſe are reckoned, The book of the Wars of the Lord[k], The book of Jaſher[l], The book of Nathan and Gad[m], The book of Shemaiah and Iddo[n], the Prophets referred to by Matthew, chap. ii. 23. The book of Enoch cited by Jude, ver. 14.

Theſe are the inſtances generally produced by the Popiſh writers, to prove the imperfection of the Canon, as to ſome of its moſt valuable parts; which though I ſhall not here particularly conſider, having only concern with the New Teſtament Canon, yet ſhall make a few ſuch remarks concerning them, as may ſerve to overthrow the objection, as far as it

[i] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 8. c. 2.
[k] Num. xxi. 14.
[l] Joſh. x. 13.
[m] 1 Chron. xxix. 29.
[n] 2 Chron. xii. 15.

relates to my Propoſition of *all truly Canonical books being ſtill extant.* I obſerve then,

1. As to ſeveral of the books mentioned in the Old Teſtament, which are ſuppoſed to be loſt, perhaps *they are the very ſame with ſome of the now-reputed Canonical Scriptures*, only under different names. Thus the book of the Wars of the Lord (if indeed it meant any book, which may be well queſtioned) was probably no other than the *book of Numbers, or ſome other part of Moſes's hiſtorical writings.* The books of Nathan and Gad, Shemaiah and Iddo, were perhaps the *ſame with the books of Samuel and Kings, &c.*

2. If we ſuppoſe them diſtinct from any now received, and the genuine writings of men who were ſometimes inſpired, *it does not at all follow, that theſe books were inſpired, and ſo received as Canonical; unleſs we will ſuppoſe, the ſame perſons, who were once under the conduct of inſpiration, muſt neceſſarily be always ſo.* This thought is ſo well managed by St. Auſtin, that I ſhall give it the reader in his own words [o]. "In the "hiſtories of the kings of Judah and Iſrael, ſeveral things are "mentioned, which are not there explained, and are referred "to as contained in other books which the prophets wrote; "and ſometimes the names of theſe prophets are mentioned; "and yet theſe writings are not extant in the Canon which "the Church of God receives. The reaſon of which I can "account for no other way, than by ſuppoſing, that thoſe "very perſons to whom the holy Spirit revealed thoſe things "which are of the higheſt authority in religion, ſometimes "wrote only as faithful hiſtorians, and at other times as pro-"phets under the influences of divine inſpiration; and that "theſe writings are ſo different from each other, that the one "ſort are to be imputed to themſelves as the authors, the "other to God as ſpeaking by them; the former are of ſer-"vice to increaſe our knowledge, the other of authority in "religion, and Canonical." So far he. To ſupport which ſentiment, I will only add the inſtance of Solomon's writings, who, though undoubtedly inſpired in ſome of his writings,

[o] De Civit. Dei, lib. 18. c. 38.

yet

yet can by none be ſuppoſed to be ſo in all, as when he wrote his *Herbal*, his *Five Thouſand Songs*, his *Diſſertations in Natural Philoſophy, about birds, inſects, fiſhes*, &c. [p] and, if we will credit Joſephus, *ſome books of Magick and Conjuration, in which were deſcribed effectual methods of caſting out devils, and curing diſtempers by enchantment, with forms of exorciſing evil ſpirits, ſo that they ſhould never return:* an art, ſays that hiſtorian, which our countrymen to this day retain from Solomon [q]. Such books (notwithſtanding the famous hiſtorian pretends, *that the arts which they contain were given him by inſpiration)* I hope the moſt bigotted advocate for tradition would be unwilling to admit into his Canon, if they ſhould be ever found.

3. *The bare citation of any book in an allowedly ſacred writing is not ſufficient to prove that book ever to have been Canonical.* If it does, we muſt then receive as the word of God the Greek poems of Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides; for paſſages are taken out of each of theſe by St. Paul [r]. And yet this is all, which the Church of Rome can ſay for ſeveral of thoſe books which they ſuppoſe are now wanting in the Canon. But he who has a mind to read more of this controverſy may ſee it well managed by Whitaker [s], Rivet [t], Spanheim [u], and Turretin [x], in the places referred to at the bottom of the page, as far as it concerns any books ſuppoſed to have been once received by the old Jewiſh Church, but now loſt.

[p] See 1 Kings iv. 32, &c.

[q] Παρέσχε δ' αὐτῷ μαθεῖν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ τὴν κατὰ τῶν Δαιμόνων τέχνην εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ θεραπείαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Ἐπῳδάς τε συνταξάμενος αἷς παρηγορεῖται τὰ νοσήματα καὶ τρόπους ἐξορκώσεων κατέλειπεν οἷς ἐνδέμενα τὰ δαιμόνια ὡς μηκέτ' ἐπανελθεῖν ἐκδιώκουσι. Antiq. Jud. l. 8. c. 2.

[r] Aratus is cited Act. xvii. 28. for thoſe words, τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν. He was a poet of Cilicia, where St. Paul was born. The words are in the beginning of his poem called *Phænomena*. See Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 1. p. 314, 315. & lib. 5. p. 597. where there are more of the ſame poet's verſes with this.

1 Cor. xv. 33. the verſe, Φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρῆσθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαὶ is taken out of Menand. in Thaid.

Tit. i. 12. the verſe, Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαὶ is taken out of Epimenides.

[s] Controverſ. I. de Script. Quæſt. VI. c. 9.

[t] Iſagog. ad Script. Sacr. c. 6.

[u] Dub. Evang. Par. 2. Dub. 88, 89.

[x] Inſtit. Theol. Loc. 2. Quæſt. 7.

CHAP. III.

The Opinion of the moſt learned Men, grounded on 1 *Cor.* v. 9. *that St. Paul wrote another Epiſtle to the Corinthians beſides the two now extant, examined and confuted, by a critical Diſcuſſion of the Place, and the Teſtimony of Clemens Romanus.*

HAVING in the foregoing chapter attempted ſome general proof, that no truly Canonical book is now wanting, I apprehend I ſhall not do juſtice to that ſubject, if I do not farther obſerve, that *many learned men*, not only of the Romiſh, but reformed Church, *have been perſuaded, that St. Paul wrote ſeveral other Epiſtles to the converted Churches, beſides thoſe which we now have.* This Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Capellus, and many others have aſſerted: Druſius has carried the matter ſomewhat farther[a], and tells us, *if theſe pieces were now extant, they ought to be eſteemed as much Canonical as any others of his writing.* The only foundation of this hypotheſis is, *that St. Paul ſeems to refer to a former Epiſtle of his*, 1 Cor. v. 9. whence, ſay theſe learned men, it is probable he *wrote another Epiſtle to the Church of Corinth, beſides the two which are extant, and ſeveral other Epiſtles now quite periſhed.* Mr. Le Clerc is ſo very ſanguine on this head, as to ſuppoſe *there might be good reaſons for tearing and burning them after they were read, and that we ſhould not have been at all the leſs diſciples of Chriſt, if ſeveral of thoſe Epiſtles, which we now have, had been loſt*[b]. But as this opinion exceedingly leſſens the authority of the Canon, I ſhall here briefly diſcuſs it, and critically enquire into that text, which is the principal and indeed only foundation of it. But before I come more particularly to make any enquiry, or examine into this matter, I deſire it may be carefully obſerved, that the examination I here propoſe does no way interfere with the enquiry I propoſe to make into the books of the catalogue above;

[a] Præterit. l. 6. in loc.
[b] Supplement to Dr. Hammond, and the Vindication of Dr. Hammond, p. 53, 54.

above; the queſtion in that caſe being concerning books, which, for the moſt part, were certainly once really extant, but are to be proved ſpurious and Apocryphal: but the queſtion here is, whether ſuch and ſuch pieces ever were in being at all; which are ſuppoſed to have been really wrote by the Apoſtles. Inaſmuch then as all that has been urged on the affirmative ſide of the queſtion, is gathered from that one text aforementioned, I apprehend, all that is neceſſary will be a particular diſcuſſion of that. In order to which I obſerve,

That it has been thought by many, that *St. Paul wrote an Epiſtle to the Corinthians, before either of thoſe of his Epiſtles to that Church, which are now extant.* This hypotheſis is founded on thoſe words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. v. 9. *I wrote to you in an Epiſtle, not to company with fornicators:* which Epiſtle, they ſuppoſe, muſt neceſſarily have been one preceding this. This has been generally the opinion, not only of the writers of the Romiſh Church, but alſo of many of the moſt celebrated Proteſtants; ſuch as Calvin [c], Beza [d], Druſius [e], Pareus [f], Grotius [g], Mr. Le Clerc [h], Dr. Collins [i], Capellus, Dr. Mill [k], and others, who make no doubt to affirm, that *St. Paul did not only, beſides the Epiſtles, which we now have under his name, write this former Epiſtle to the Chriſtians at Corinth, but ſeveral others, now loſt as this is; and that we have very great reaſon with gratitude to acknowledge the kind providence of God, which has preſerved to us ſo many of the Apoſtle's writings.* In anſwer to this opinion I would obſerve,

1. That it is very improbable, becauſe, *not one of the antient Chriſtian writers have ever mentioned any ſuch Epiſtle; nor is there to be found, in all antiquity, any citation out of it, or ſo much as the moſt diſtant reference to it:* it being a thing never thought of by any of the Fathers, that St. Paul wrote more than the fourteen Epiſtles we now have. Hence the moſt early writers of Chriſtianity, who are ſuppoſed to have

[c] Comment. in loc.
[d] Annot. in loc.
[e] Præterit. lib. 6. in loc.
[f] Annot. in loc.
[g] Annot. in loc.
[h] Annot. in loc.
[i] See his Engliſh Annotations on this Epiſtle.
[k] See Dr. Mill's Prolegom. §. 8.

been

been contemporary with St. Paul himſelf, ſuch as Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, &c. though they ſeveral times take paſſages out of his Epiſtles, and even out of thoſe two, which are now extant, to the Church at Corinth, have not the leaſt obſcure intimation of any other.

2. *There are very many circumſtances, both relating to the time and occaſion of that, which we now call the firſt Epiſtle of Paul to the Corinthians, which will evidently prove, that it was the firſt he ever wrote to that Church.* For the proof of this, I muſt refer the reader to what is hereafter ſaid in the particular diſſertation on this Epiſtle.

3. I offer it as a conjecture to the learned in Chriſtian antiquities, *whether the following paſſage in Clemens Romanus do not prove the Epiſtle now called the firſt to the Corinthians, to be the firſt which St. Paul wrote to that Church.* The words of Clemens are[1], "Take again the Epiſtle of the bleſſed "Apoſtle Paul into your hands. What was it that he *firſt* "*wrote to you* in the beginning of his Epiſtle? He did truly "by the Spirit write to you concerning himſelf, and Cephas, "and Apollos, becauſe even at that time you were formed "into diviſions or parties." The paſſage he refers to of St. Paul is plainly that in the firſt chapter of the preſent firſt Epiſtle, v. 12. *Now this I ſay, that every one of you ſaith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, &c.* Now, ſays Clemens, this is what St. Paul *firſt of all wrote to you, or what he wrote the firſt time of his writing*; than which I cannot ſee what elſe it was poſſible for Clemens to mean by the words πρῶτον ἔγραψεν. Now hence I argue, that if Clemens, who is ſuppoſed contemporary with St. Paul, and to have wrote this Epiſtle to the Church of Corinth, not long after St. Paul, did imagine that Apoſtle had wrote no Epiſtle to that Church before that which he there cites, and which is now called *the*

[1] Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου· τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ τε Κηφᾶ, καὶ Ἀπόλλω, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς ποιῆσθαι. Epiſt. 1. ad Corinth. p. 106.

firſt

firſt, we have the faireſt reaſon to conclude, *there was no one written ſooner.*

The only objection which I can think of, that can be made againſt this, is, that what Clemens calls *Paul's Goſpel* [Εὐαγγελίῳ] I tranſlate *his Epiſtle.* To which it is eaſy to anſwer, that beſides that the words, which he cites, are in the forementioned place of his Epiſtle, it has been often obſerved by Clement's commentators[m], that the word *Goſpel* is uſed frequently for any of the ſacred books of the New Teſtament, as the word *Law* is frequently put for all the books of the Old[n].

4. It being thus probable, that St. Paul did not write a former Epiſtle to the Corinthians, we have juſt ground *to interpret the conteſted paſſage in a different ſenſe from that commonly received*; and this, I think, may be very eaſily done, without any violence done to the expreſſion, of *this ſame Epiſtle, and what he had before wrote to them in it.* Ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *I have wrote to you in the Epiſtle*, or *this Epiſtle, i. e. I have told you in the foregoing part of my letter.* So he had indeed ſeveral times in the preceding part of the chapter, ver. 2, 5, 6. that they ſhould have no converſation with the inceſtuous perſon. I know it is commonly objected, that this ſenſe cannot be juſt, becauſe of the words ver. 11. *But now I have written to you*; which, ſay Beza, Pareus, and Le Clerc, *muſt needs be meant of another diſtinct time of writing, and not the ſame*; and this indeed is the main ſtrength of their opinion. But a cloſe conſideration of the context will make it very clear, that no ſuch inference can be juſtly drawn from the words, Νυνὶ δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, *but now I have written to you.* In the beginning of the chapter he had declared to them, it was their duty to avoid the ſociety of fornicators, and ſuch ſort of perſons. It is plain from ver. 10. he apprehended they were in danger of miſtaking his meaning, by extending the prohibition ſo far, *as not to have any converſe at all with the world*; *i. e. with the Gentiles*, who were generally guilty of

[m] See Patr. Junius and Dr. Fell in loc.

[n] John x. 34. xv. 25. & 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

theſe

theſe crimes. The Apoſtle found it neceſſary to prevent their miſtake, and therefore repeats what he had before wrote, and tells them how they ſhould underſtand it, viz. *only with relation to the profeſſors of Chriſtianity*, who were guilty of theſe execrable vices. This occaſioned the words, Νυνὶ δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, which will be more clear from the following paraphraſe of ver. 9, 10, 11.

Verſe 9. "I wrote to you a little above, in my letter, "that you ſhould ſeparate from thoſe who were fornicators, "(ver. 2.) and becauſe you may be in danger of being defiled "by them, that you purge them as old leaven, (ver. 5, 6.)

Verſe 10. "But fearing leſt you ſhould miſtake me, I do "not mean thoſe who are heathens, and thoſe who are forni-"cators, covetous, extortioners, or idolaters among them; "it being impoſſible for you, living in the world, to avoid "commerce with them:

Verſe 11. "But this I mean, and is what I now write "to you, that you do not freely converſe with, nor admit to "eat the Lord's Supper with you, thoſe who are charged "with the forementioned crimes, and yet make a profeſſion "of Chriſtianity."

This ſeems a very natural account of the Apoſtle's reaſoning [o], and will appear the more probable if we conſider,

1. That he uſes the ſame verb συναναμίγνυσθαι in ver. 11. which he does ver. 9.

2. That the particle νυνὶ often is uſed in Greek, not as a note of time, but in an adverſative ſenſe, the ſame as *ſed* and *nunc vero* in Latin, and the word *now* very often in Engliſh [p].

3. The article ſeems to refer only to this ſame Epiſtle, and not another, and to denote the ſame with ταύτῃ, as it often does [q]; ſo we find it with the very ſame ſubſtantive, 1 Theſſ. v. 27. viz. τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, to expreſs the very ſame Epiſtle which he was then writing.

[o] The ſame almoſt may be ſeen in Sixtus Senenſis Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. in Paul. and Dr. Hammond on 1 Cor. v. 9.

[p] So νυνὶ is uſed more than once in this ſame Epiſtle. See c. xii. 18. xv. 20. and νῦν very often. c. vii. 14. xii. 20. Vide Grot. in loc. et Glaſſ. Gram. Sacr. lib. 3. Tract. 5. Canon. 13.

[q] See Glaſſ. Gram. Sacr. lib. 3. Tract. 2.

4. The

4. The old Syriack tranſlator, who lived, as has been proved, near St. Paul's time, well knowing there was no former Epiſtle of his to the Church at Corinth, paraphraſes the paſſage, ver. 11. in the ſame manner as above, in theſe words, ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܬܒܬ ܠܟܘܢ i. e. *This is what I have wrote to you*, or *the meaning of what I have* wrote to you; by which it is plain he did not imagine the Apoſtle writing a new Epiſtle, but explaining ſomewhat he had before written in this.

Thus it ſeems manifeſt, that St. Paul's words do not intimate his having wrote a former Epiſtle to the Corinthians. There is indeed a different interpretation from that above put upon the words by ſome learned men, who tranſlate ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *I wrote*, or *had written*, or *was about to write in this Epiſtle*, that you ſhould not company with fornicators, &c. but now hearing this high offence, I ſharpen my ſtyle, and forbid not only aſſociating with ſuch, but even common fellowſhip. This is Dr. Lightfoot's conjecture [r], and eſpouſed by Dr. Whitby [s], but ſeems very precarious and groundleſs.

1. *Becauſe it ſuppoſes the Apoſtle to have had different ſentiments as to what he was to write*, which indeed Dr. Whitby is not afraid in ſo many words to aver; *ſome things*, ſays he, *in this Epiſtle, were changed by him before he ſent it to them.* But how apparently abſurd is this, to imagine this great Apoſtle under the conduct of inſpiration, firſt to write one thing and then another? If the inſpired penmen of Scripture could thus alter their ſentiments, and make changes in what they wrote, what muſt we think of the infallibility of that Spirit who dictated to them? But as I verily believe Dr. Lightfoot thought not at all of this conſequence of his opinion; ſo I am perſuaded, Dr. Whitby, who is ſo zealous an advocate for inſpiration, would have been far from eſpouſing it, had he thought more of it.

2. The paraphraſe of the text, according to this interpretation, is very different from the Apoſtle's meaning, as appears from what is already ſaid.

[r] Harmony of the N. Teſt. in loc. [s] Annot. in loc.

Dr.

Dr. Lightfoot, in another part of his works [t], has a quite different conjecture concerning the paſſage of St. Paul under debate, which though perhaps it be entirely groundleſs, may not be unworthy of the learned reader's notice. It is, in ſhort, a ſort of compounding the matter between thoſe, who imagine a former Epiſtle to the Corinthians now loſt, and thoſe who think the contrary. I ſhall think it ſufficient, having having ſaid ſo much on this head already, to give the reader a tranſlation of the Doctor's own words: "The Apoſtle," ſays he, "had ſent Timothy to the Corinthians, before he wrote "this Epiſtle to them (chap. iv. 17.) and it is probable he "had ſent ſome Epiſtle by him, in which he had written "thus (viz. the words of verſe the ninth; *that they ſhould "not keep company with fornicators.*) But when Stephen, "Fortunatus and Achaicus came, and laid before him the "ſtate of the Church at Corinth, and gave him both letters "and certain queſtions from that Church, inaſmuch as "they knew Timothy was not yet arrived at Corinth, he "comprehends and ſuperſedes (or ſuppreſſes) that former "Epiſtle in this. So that in ſome ſenſe you may truly ſay "that Epiſtle is loſt, inaſmuch as an exact copy of it is not "now extant; but in another ſenſe you cannot truly ſay ſo, "becauſe all things which were contained in that Epiſtle, we "have in that which is now extant, and many other things "beſides."

[t] Hor. Hebr. in 1 Cor. v. 9.

CHAP. IV.

An Epiſtle, under St. Paul's Name, to the Corinthians, and of the Corinthians to St. Paul, now extant in an Armenian Manuſcript, tranſlated out of Mr. La Croze's Latin into Engliſh, with ſome Remarks.

THE preceding pages being taken up with an enquiry into that important queſtion, whether St. Paul wrote any Epiſtle to the Church of Corinth, before either of thoſe which are now extant; it will not be foreign to the ſame purpoſe to obſerve, *that there are now extant in the world an Epiſtle under the name of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (different from the received ones) *and an Epiſtle under the name of the Church of Corinth to St. Paul.* It is not indeed properly my buſineſs here to make any enquiry into Apocryphal pieces now extant; that being left for the third Part of this work, and the loſt books only propoſed to come under conſideration here. But inaſmuch as theſe two Epiſtles will not in any other part of this work come within my propoſal to be diſcuſſed, deſigning only to enquire into thoſe pieces which are mentioned by ſome writer of the firſt four centuries, whereas theſe are not by any, I hope it will not be unacceptable, if I digreſs a little here: and, ſince I have been diſcourſing ſo much on a loſt Epiſtle of St. Paul's to the Corinthians, preſent the reader with theſe two antient pieces, which I believe have not yet appeared in our language, nor till lately in Europe, adding ſome ſhort reflections on them.

The firſt account, as far as I know, of them in print, is that of the learned Dr. Gregory in the *Preface to his notes on ſome paſſages of Scripture*: "I have ſeen," ſays he, "the third "Epiſtle of St. Paul to the Corinthians in the Armenian "tongue, beginning, *Paul a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. "and an Epiſtle of the Corinthians to St. Paul in the ſame "tongue, beginning, *Stephen, &c. to our Brother Paul greet-"ing.*" In a Latin marginal note, he adds, that the manuſcript

ſcript with an Italian verſion was in the library of Sir Gilbert North. The famous Archbiſhop Uſher ſaw the ſame manuſcript in the ſame learned gentleman's cuſtody, and only informs us farther, that it was wrote at Smyrna[a], taking a ſmall ſentence out of the Epiſtle of the Corinthians to Paul. In the year 1715, Mr. David Wilkins tranſlated both Epiſtles out of the Armenian tongue into Latin, from a manuſcript in the library of Mr. Maſſon at Utrecht, which are ſince printed by Fabritius, with another Latin verſion made by Mr. La Croze, library keeper to the King of Pruſſia, in the year 1716[b], from which, as being the laſt, and, as he ſays, a more literal and exact verſion than the former[c], I have made the following one in Engliſh.

The EPISTLE of the CORINTHIANS to ST. PAUL.

N. B. I place this firſt, becauſe the other is evidently deſigned as an Anſwer to this.

STEPHEN, and the preſbyters who are with him, Nemenus, Eubulus, Theophilus, and Nomeſon, to our Brother Paul, greeting. Certain men, whoſe names are Simon and Clobeus, are come to Corinth, who by their artful and deluſive ſpeeches have very much ſhocked the faith of ſome, to which it is incumbent on you to make anſwer yourſelf; for we have neither heard from you, or any other Apoſtle, ſuch doctrines. But this one thing we know, that we faithfully retain (*or* obſerve) whatever we learnt from you, or the other (*Apoſtles.*) We eſteem it a very great inſtance of divine compaſſion to us, that you are ſtill in the body with us, and that we may again hear you, (*or* from you.) As ſoon therefore as may be, either write to us what we muſt ſtedfaſtly hold (*as truth*), or elſe, let it not be long before you viſit us in perſon.

[a] Vid. Not. in Epiſt. Ignat. ad Trall. §. 84.

[b] Fabrit. Cod. Apoc. Nov. Teſt. Par. 3. p. 667.

[c] See his Remarks upon theſe Armenian Epiſtles, in Fabrit. Cod. Apoc. Nov. Teſt. Par. 3. p. 680. & p. 683.

We

We believe in the Lord, and that he ſhewed himſelf in a manifeſt manner, and has delivered us from the hands of the evil one. But their words are erroneous; for they ſay, there is no neceſſity of reading the Prophets; That God is not Almighty; That there will be no reſurrection of the dead; That fleſh is not by any means made by God; That the body of Jeſus Chriſt was not born of the virgin Mary; and laſtly, That the world was not made by God, but by ſome angel. Endeavour therefore, Brother, to come ſpeedily to us, that the city of Corinth may continue without offences, and the folly *(or ignorance)* of thoſe men may be brought to a juſt contempt before all. Farewell in the Lord.

The EPISTLE of PAUL to the CORINTHIANS.

PAUL, a priſoner of Jeſus Chriſt, to the Brethren at Corinth, haraſſed with various trials, greeting. I do not at all wonder, that ye are ſo ſoon accoſted with ſuch, who would draw you aſide to impiety. For as our Lord Jeſus is about ſoon to haſten (*or* perfect) his coming, there are (*or rather* will be) thoſe, who both change and deſpiſe his commandments. But I from the beginning did teach you the very ſame things, which I received from the former Apoſtles, who had conſtant converſation with our Lord. I ſay then, that our Lord Jeſus was born of the virgin Mary, of the ſeed of David, according to that which the Holy Spirit ſent into her by the Father from heaven declared, namely, that Jeſus ſhould appear in the world, and by his fleſh ſhould work deliverance for all fleſh, and raiſe us again from the dead; of which reſurrection he gave us a plain inſtance in himſelf. Farther, it is manifeſt, that man was created by the Father, and therefore not ſo abandoned to miſery, but that he ſhould be again ſought after with care; for he was ſo ſought after, as that by a filial adoption he might obtain life. For God, who is the Lord of all, and the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, firſt ſent Prophets to the Jews, to diſſuade them from their ſins, and incite them to righteouſneſs: for when he intended the ſalvation of the houſe of Iſrael, he beſtowed his

Holy Spirit, and ſent him into the Prophets, who preached the worſhip of God not liable to error, and the birth (*of Chriſt*) for a very long time.

I ſhall not here enter into any particular criticiſm on theſe two letters, no mention being made of them within my preſcribed time; only offer to the reader, who is curious in theſe things, a few curſory remarks I have made in reading them. As,

Firſt, That if we ſuppoſe St. Paul did really write an Epiſtle to the Church of Corinth before either of thoſe now received, and which he refers to in the words above cited, 1 Cor. v. 9. *this Epiſtle here tranſlated cannot be it, becauſe there is in this no prohibition of aſſociating with fornicators*, which is ſuppoſed to have been in the other, and certainly was in it, if he ever wrote any. Hence it appears either to have been too great a compliment or overſight in Mr. Wilkins, the tranſlator of theſe Epiſtles, in his dedication of them to Mr. La Croze, to deſire his opinion, whether St. Paul did not refer to this Epiſtle of his in the forementioned place.

2dly. This Epiſtle under the name of St. Paul to the Corinthians, *is certainly ſpurious*; becauſe,

1. *It is not mentioned by any one writer of the primitive Church in the firſt four centuries, nor indeed by any Chriſtian author in any age till the laſt.* It is neither quoted, nor placed in any of their catalogues, nor read in any of their Churches; and therefore, by Prop. III, IV, V, VI, muſt be judged Apocryphal; as alſo becauſe it is not in the Syriack copies of the New Teſtament, Prop. XV.

2. *It contains things contrary to thoſe which are certainly known to be true*, and therefore Apocryphal by Prop. VIII. Such is that intimation of the ſecond coming of Chriſt being very near, in the beginning of the Epiſtle; a notion which was very much eſpouſed by ſome of the antient hereticks. See Dr. Hammond on 2 Theſſ. ii. 2.

3. *It contains ſeveral things very unlike to, and different from St. Paul's known way of writing*; and therefore ſpurious by Prop. XI. Such for inſtance,

1.) Is

1.) Is the ſalutation in the beginning; *Paul a priſoner—— to the Brethren at Corinth——greeting*; a phraſeology not known in his, or any of the firſt Chriſtian ſalutations in their Epiſtles.

2.) *The author's declaring that he received what he taught them from the former Apoſtles, who converſed with Chriſt*; whereas St. Paul very frequently aſſures the Churches to whom he wrote, and particularly this Church of Corinth, that *what he preached among them, he received not from men, but by immediate revelation from the Lord.* See 1 Cor. xi. 23. and Gal. i. 12. Eph. iii. 2, 3.

Thus much may ſuffice concerning the ſpurioufneſs of this Epiſtle under St. Paul's name. There is no need of any ſuch remarks on the Corinthians Epiſtle to Paul; ſince, if it were real and genuine, I know no claim it could make to Canonical authority. Only one thing I cannot forbear obſerving, which is a very clear detection of the forgery. They deſire Paul to be very ſpeedy in viſiting them at Corinth; whereas St. Paul was at that time, as he expreſsly calls himſelf, a priſoner. This does not ſeem very conſiſtent; for ſuch a deſire ſuppoſes Paul to have been at his own liberty. I ſhall only add, that Mr. La Croze ſuppoſes theſe Epiſtles forged either in the end of the tenth, or the beginning of the eleventh century.

CHAP. V.

The Acts of Andrew received by the Encratites, Manichees, Apoſtolicks, or Apotactick and Origenians, diſcuſſed, and proved Apocryphal.

A.

I PROCEED now to the particular examination of the loſt Apocryphal books, according to the order in which they are placed in the alphabetical table at the end of the firſt

Part; and ſo ſhall begin with that antient book which was called,

The ACTS of the Apoſtle ANDREW.

N. B. IN conſidering this, as all the other Apocryphal books, the method I purpoſe to obſerve is, firſt to produce all and every thing that is ſaid of them by the antient writers, and then to make the moſt ſuitable reflections I can.

This Book is mentioned firſt by Euſebius [a].

Τὰς ὀνόματι τῶν ἀποστόλων πρὸς τῶν αἱρετικῶν προφερομένας——ὡς Ἀνδρέου πράξεις ——ὧν οὐδὲν ὑδαμῶς ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνὴρ εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἠξίωσεν. Πόρρω δέ πως καὶ ὁ τῆς φράσεως παρὰ τὸ ἦθος τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ἐναλλάττει χαρακτήρ· ἥ τε γνώμη καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς φερομένων προαίρεσις πολλῆς ὅσον τῆς ἀληθοῦς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀπᾴδουσα, ὅτι δὴ αἱρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀναπλάσματα τυγχάνει, σαφῶς παρίστησιν· ὅθεν οὐδ' ἐν νόθοις αὐτὰ καταλακτέον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄτοπα πάντη καὶ δυσσεβῆ παραιτητέον.

Books publiſhed under the name of the Apoſtles by hereticks——ſuch as *the Acts of Andrew*——which are never thought worthy to be cited in the works of any eccleſiaſtical writer who taught in the Church. Moreover, the phraſeology and manner of writing, and the doctrines therein delivered being very oppoſite to the orthodox faith, evidently demonſtrate it to have been the forgery of hereticks; and ſo not only to be looked upon as ſpurious, but to be utterly rejected as impious and abſurd.

2. By Philaſtrius, in his Account of the Hereſy which he ſtyles Apocrypha [b].

Manichæi Apocrypha beati Andreæ Apoſtoli, i. e. Actus quos fecit veniens de Ponto

The Manichees make uſe of the Acts of St. Andrew, i. e. thoſe Acts which he made (or

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25. [b] Hæreſ. 87.

in

in Græciam, quos conſcripſerunt tunc ſequentes Apoſtolum; unde & habent Manichæi, & alii tales, Andreæ beati & Joannis Actus Evangeliſtæ, beati & Petri ſimiliter Apoſtoli, & Pauli pariter Apoſtoli: in quibus, quia ſigna fecerunt magna, ut & canes & beſtiæ loquerentur, etiam & animas hominum tales velut canum & pecudum, ſimiles imputaverunt eſſe hæretici perditi.

did) in his journey from Pontus to Greece, and which thoſe Diſciples, which followed him, wrote; from whence the Manichees, and other ſuch ſort of people, have the Acts of St. Andrew, St. John the Evangeliſt, as alſo the Acts of St. Peter and St. Paul the Apoſtles: in which, becauſe they wrought great miracles, ſuch as to make dogs and beaſts to ſpeak, theſe wretched hereticks imagined the ſouls of men to be like the ſouls of dogs and beaſts.

3. By Epiphanius, diſcourſing of the Hereticks called Encratites [c].

Κέχρηνται δὲ γραφαῖς πρώτοτύπως ταῖς λεγομέναις Ἀνδρέου, καὶ Ἰωάννου πράξεσι, καὶ Θωμᾶ· καὶ ἀποκρύφοις τισὶ, καὶ οἷς βέλονται λόγοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.

They principally made uſe of thoſe Scriptures, which are called the Acts of Andrew and John, and Thomas, and ſome other Apocryphal books, and only what they thought fit of the books of the Old Teſtament.

4. By the ſame, ſpeaking of the Hereſy of the Apoſtolicks [d].

Οὗτοι δὲ ταῖς λεγομέναις πράξεσιν Ἀνδρέου τε καὶ Θωμᾶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐπερείδονται, παντάπασιν ἀλλότριοι τῆς κανόνος τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ὑπάρχοντες.

They chiefly depended upon thoſe Scriptures, which are called the Acts of Andrew and of Thomas, being altogether different from the Canon of the Church.

[c] Hæreſ. 47. §. 1. [d] Hæreſ. 61. §. 1.

5. By the ſame, concerning the vile Hereſy of the Origenians [e].

Κέχρηνται δὲ ἀποκρύφοις τισὶ, μάλιστα ταῖς λεγομέναις πράξεσιν Ἀνδρέου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων.	They make uſe of ſeveral Apocryphal books, but principally thoſe which are called the Acts of Andrew, and ſome others.

6. By Pope Gelaſius [f].

Actus nomine Andreæ Apoſtoli Apocryphi.	The Acts under the name of Andrew the Apoſtle are Apocryphal.

Theſe are all the places where expreſs mention is made of theſe Acts of Andrew; from whence it is eaſy, by the rules above laid down, to prove they were ſpurious and Apocryphal, as being not found in any of the antient catalogues of the ſacred books, (Prop. IV.) nor appealed to by any Chriſtian writer, (Prop. V.) nor read in any of their aſſemblies; (Prop. VI.) but on the contrary expreſsly condemned as an impious forgery, by every one that has mentioned them. There are not indeed any fragments of this book now remaining; yet it ſeems not difficult to gueſs at ſome things contained therein by *the agreement of the abovementioned hereticks in receiving and eſteeming it above all other Scriptures.* This cannot be ſuppoſed to have happened by mere chance, nor by any other means more probable, than that this book contained ſome doctrines or principles which were very conformable to the ſentiments of thoſe differing ſects. What their opinions were, I need not here lay down; a bare caſting the eye upon the accounts, which Epiphanius, in the places cited, and Auſtin, in his little book of hereſies, gives of them, would be almoſt ſufficient of itſelf to make one queſtion the authority of any book which

[e] Hæreſ. 63. §. 2.
[f] Decret. de Apocryph. apud Gratian. Diſtinct. 15. et apud Concil. Sanct. Tom. 4. p. 1260.

they

they had a more than ordinary eſteem for. I ſhall only offer to the reader the obſervations I have made concerning the agreement between theſe differing ſects, and then leave it to his own judgment to determine, whether it be not probable the Acts of Andrew contained ſome doctrines which were favourable to them all. The ſects I am ſpeaking of are thoſe above mentioned, the Manichees, Encratites, Apotacticks, or Apoſtolicks, and Origenians, who all, as has been proved, eſteemed this Apocryphal piece of Andrew above other Scriptures; and the obſervations I have made, for greater clearneſs, I have placed in the following table.

The Manichees aſſerted,	*The Encratites aſſerted,*	*The Apoſtolicks, or Apotacticks, aſſerted,*	*The Origenians aſſerted,*
1. Two eternal principles of all things, oppoſite to each other, viz. God and the Devil.	1. Two principles; one of the Devil, oppoſite to the works of God, and not ſubject, but ſuperior to him.		
2. The unlawfulneſs of marriage, and eſteemed it as bad as fornication.	2. That marriage was of the Devil; reckoned all married perſons as fornicators, and admitted no married perſons to their communion.	2. The unlawfulneſs of all marriages; excluded their communion all who did marry.	2. That no perſon ſhould marry; and that they only were virtuous, who, like Elijah, Eliſha, and John, did never marry.
3. That no perſon ſhould at any time eat fleſh.	3. That no perſon ſhould eat fleſh.		
4. That no wine ſhould be drank.	4. The ſame.		

More of this ſort may be ſeen in Epiphanius, Hæreſ. 47, 61, 63, and 66; and in Auſtin, de Hæreſib. ad Quodvult. c. 25, 40, 42, and 46.

Let now any impartial perſon judge, whether it be not probable, that the reaſon why theſe ſeveral parties and ſects did ſo mightily eſteem the Acts of Andrew, was, becauſe they found ſome of their peculiar and favourite notions therein; and, if ſo, then we have another argument, whereby to conclude it Apocryphal, viz. that it contained aſſertions contrary to thoſe which are certainly known to be true by Prop. VIII.

CHAP. VI.

Other Books under the Name of Andrew conſidered: they were the ſame with the Acts of Leucius. The Goſpel of Andrew. The Decree of Pope Gelaſius, relating to Apocryphal Books, produced, with its various Lections: the Antiquity of this Decree.

Numb. II. Some other Apocryphal Books under the Name of the Apoſtle ANDREW.

I ENTITLE them *other*, although, perhaps, they may appear to have been the ſame with the former, becauſe they are not mentioned expreſsly as the Acts of Andrew.

Theſe are recorded,

1. By Auſtin, confuting the anonymous Author, whom he ſtyles *Adverſarius Legis & Prophetarum*[a].

Sane de Apocryphis rite poſuit teſtimonia, quæ ſub nominibus Apoſtolorum, Andreæ, Johanniſque conſcripta ſunt; quæ, ſi illorum eſſent, recepta eſſent ab Eccleſia, quæ ab illorum

He hath made uſe of teſtimonies out of ſome Apocryphal pieces, which were written under the names of the Apoſtles, Andrew and John; which, if they were truly

[a] Contra Adverſar. Leg. & Prophet. lib. 1. c. 20.

lorum temporibus, per Epiſcoporum ſucceſſiones certiſſimas uſque ad noſtra tempora perſeverat.

theirs, would have been received by the Church, which has continued under an uninterrupted ſucceſſion of Biſhops from their time to ours.

2. By Pope Innocent I [b].

Cætera autem, quæ ſub nomine Matthiæ——vel ſub nomine Andreæ, quæ a Nexocharide & Leonide philoſophis ſcripta ſunt——non ſolum repudianda, verum etiam noveris eſſe damnanda.

But the reſt [of the books] which are written under the name of Matthias——or under the name of Andrew, which were written by Nexocharides and Leonides the philoſophers, are not only to be rejected, but condemned.

Whatever the ſubject of theſe books was, they appear plainly to have been ſpurious by the expreſs teſtimony of both thoſe who mention them. Prop. III, IV, V. I have only to add, that perhaps theſe books, as alſo the former, viz. the Acts of Andrew, were either wholly, or in part, the ſame with the Acts of the Apoſtles under the name of Leucius, which I ſhall particularly conſider in its proper place, under the Letter L. As alſo who the philoſophers Leonides and Nexocharides (mentioned in this Decree of Pope Innocent, as the authors of this book) were.

Numb. III. The Goſpel of ANDREW the Apoſtle.

THIS book is not mentioned by any, but by Gelaſius in his Decree [c]:

His Words are,

Evangelium nomine Andreæ Apoſtoli Apocryphum.

The Goſpel under the name of Andrew the Apoſtle is Apocryphal.

[b] Decret. Innocent. I. Epiſt. 3. ad Exuper. Tholoſ. Epiſcop. c. 7.

[c] Loc. citat.

As

As there are not any fragments of this Goſpel extant, nor any other teſtimonies concerning it, it is impoſſible for us now to form any particular idea of it, either as to its real author or contents. It is probable, it was firſt forged and uſed by the ſame Hereticks, as the other books under that Apoſtle's name; however, it is eaſy to prove, it never was reputed to be a Canonical book, by Prop. IV, V, VI. I have only farther to obſerve, after Mr. Fabritius [d], that in ſome copies of this famous Decree of Gelaſius, there is no mention made of this Goſpel under Andrew's name; and if theſe ſhould happen to be the beſt copies, it will then follow, that there never was any ſuch Goſpel in the world.

Having occaſion here, as I often ſhall hereafter, to make mention of this Decree of Pope Gelaſius, concerning the Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament, I perſuade myſelf, it will be a very excuſable digreſſion, if I give the unlearned reader a tranſlation of the Decree itſelf, as far as it concerns any books which fall within my deſign.

The DECREE of Pope GELASIUS, concerning Apocryphal Books.

1. The Travels under the name of Peter the Apoſtle, which is alſo called the Eight Books [e] of St. Clemens, are Apocryphal.

2. The Acts under the name of Andrew the Apoſtle are Apocryphal.

3. The Acts under the name of Philip the Apoſtle are Apocryphal.

4. The Acts under the name of Peter the Apoſtle are Apocryphal [f].

5. The Acts under the name of Thomas the Apoſtle are Apocryphal.

[d] Cod. Apoc. Nov. Teſt. par. 3. p. 526.

[e] Other copies for eight read nine, others ten.

[f] In ſome copies this is not mentioned.

6. The

6. The Goſpel under the name of Thaddæus is Apocryphal [g].

7. The Goſpel under the name of Thomas the Apoſtle, which the Manichees uſe, is Apocryphal.

8. The Goſpel under the name of Barnabas is Apocryphal.

9. The Goſpel under the name of Bartholomew the Apoſtle is Apocryphal [h].

10. The Goſpel under the name of Andrew the Apoſtle is Apocryphal.

11. The Goſpels corrupted by Lucianus are Apocryphal.

12. The Goſpels corrupted by Heſychius are Apocryphal.

13. The Goſpel of the Infancy of our Saviour is Apocryphal [i].

14. The Book of the Nativity of our Saviour, of St. Mary, and the Midwife of our Saviour, is Apocryphal.

15. The Book which is called The Shepherd is Apocryphal.

16. All the Books which Lentitius, the diſciple of the Devil, made, are Apocryphal.

17. The Book which is called The Acts of Thecla and Paul the Apoſtle is Apocryphal.

18. The Revelation aſcribed to Thomas the Apoſtle is Apocryphal.

19. The Revelation aſcribed to Paul the Apoſtle is Apocryphal.

20. The Revelation aſcribed to Stephen is Apocryphal.

21. The Travels, or Acts of St. Mary are Apocryphal.

22. The Book called The Lots of the Apoſtles is Apocryphal.

23. The Book called The Praiſe of the Apoſtles is Apocryphal.

24. The Book of The Canon of the Apoſtles is Apocryphal.

25. The Letters of Jeſus to King Abgarus is Apocryphal.

I may perhaps have occaſion hereafter more critically to enquire into the genuine authority of this Decree of Ge-

[g] Other copies read here, The Goſpel of Matthias; others both Thaddæus and Matthias.

[h] After this, ſome copies have The Goſpel of James the Leſs, and Peter.

[i] This is omitted in ſome copies.

laſius;

laſius; I ſhall now only obſerve, that it is generally agreed to be very antient, and by moſt learned men, to have been formed in the Council of Rome, A. C. 494. Thoſe who have examined the manuſcripts tell us, that in ſome of them it is aſcribed to Damaſus, who lived in the century before Gelaſius, and in others to Hormiſdas, who lived the century after: whence Baluzius ſeems rightly to conjecture, that Pope Damaſus began the Decree, Gelaſius renewed and made ſome additions to it, and Hormiſdas afterwards farther enlarged and confirmed it [k]. It is true, Biſhop Pearſon, in his celebrated Vindication of Ignatius's Epiſtles, attempts to prove, from this variety of titles, that the Decree is ſpurious, as alſo by other arguments [l], which are approved by Dr. Cave, and tranſlated into his excellent Work [m]. But it is not at all ſtrange theſe learned men ſhould reject this Decree, when we conſider it as directly oppoſite to ſome notions, which they would have been much more unwilling to part with than this Decree.

CHAP. VII.

The Goſpel of Apelles: his Age and Principles. The Goſpel according to the Twelve Apoſtles: it was the ſame with the Goſpel of the Hebrews.

Numb. IV. The GOSPEL of APELLES.

THIS Goſpel is not mentioned by any writer till Jerome, who places it among ſeveral other Apocryphal pieces of the New Teſtament, whoſe words, becauſe I ſhall frequently refer to them, I ſhall here tranſcribe at length [a].

[k] See Spanheim Hiſt. Chriſt. Secul. V. c. 8 juxta fin. and Dallæus de Pſeudepig. Apoſtol. l. 3. c. 3, 4, &c.

[l] Vindic. Ignat. Par. 1. c. 4. p. 44, &c.

[m] Hiſtor. Liter. in Gelaſ.

[a] Præfat. in Comm. in Matth.

Plures

Plures fuiſſe, qui Evangelia ſcripſerunt, Lucas Evangeliſta teſtatur, dicens, *quoniam quidem multi*, &c. quæ a diverſis auctoribus edita, diverſarum hæreſium fuere principia, ut eſt illud juxta Ægyptios, & Thomam, & Matthiam, & Bartholomæum, duodecim quoque Apoſtolorum, & Baſilidis atque Apellis, ac reliquorum, quæ enumerare longiſſimum eſt: cum hæc tantum impræſentiarum neceſſe ſit dicere, extitiſſe quoſdam, qui, ſine ſpiritu & gratia Dei, conati ſunt magis ordinare narrationem, quam hiſtoriæ texere veritatem.

The Evangeliſt Luke declares, that there were many who wrote Goſpels, when he ſays, *foraſmuch as many*, &c. (c. i. ver. 1.) which being publiſhed by various authors, gave birth to ſeveral hereſies; ſuch as that according to the Egyptians, and Thomas, and Matthias, and Bartholomew, that of the Twelve Apoſtles, and Baſilides, and Apelles, and others, which it would be tedious to enumerate: in relation to theſe, it will be enough at preſent to ſay, that there have been certain men, who endeavoured, without the ſpirit and grace of God, rather to ſet forth ſome ſort of account, than to publiſh a true hiſtory.

This Goſpel is conſiderable, as it appears to have been received by ſome Chriſtians who were the diſciples of its author in the latter end of the ſecond century. Mr. Fabritius ſuppoſes, that Apelles did not write any new diſtinct Goſpel, but only formed one out of the true and genuine Goſpels, that, as Marcion, he might be thought the author of a new Goſpel: but however true this ſuppoſition may be, it is not worthy of any great note, becauſe it is moſt certain, that moſt of the Goſpels which the Hereticks made uſe of were formed out of the true and genuine Goſpels, with the addition and omiſſion of what they thought proper. However, it is evident, it was an Apocryphal piece, by Prop. IV, V, VI. and inaſmuch as Jerome tells us, it was calculated to promote the hereſy of its author, it muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed to have contained aſſertions contrary to thoſe certainly known to be true,

true, and therefore to be rejected by Prop. VIII. To confirm which obſervation, I ſhall here give the reader ſome ſhort account of Apelles and his doctrines.

He was a diſciple of the famous heretick Marcion, and became famous about the year of Chriſt 180. He wrote many impious Tracts againſt the ſacred Scriptures, rejected both the law and the prophets, maintained there was one principle of all things, who was the good God, from whom proceeded the evil God, who made all things. He denied the reſurrection of the dead, and publiſhed a collection of revelations, which he received from a noted ſtrumpet, whoſe name was Philumene, of which both Tertullian and Euſebius give us an account [b], as do Origen [c], Epiphanius [d], and Auſtin of the other particulars [e].

Numb. V. The GOSPEL according to the TWELVE APOSTLES.

CONCERNING this Apocryphal piece, unqueſtionably very antient, we have an account given us;

1. By Origen [f].

Eccleſia quatuor habet Evangelia, Hæreſes plurima; e quibus quoddam ſcribitur ſecundum Ægyptios, aliud juxta duodecim Apoſtolos——Legimus, ne quid ignorare videremur, &c.

The Church receives four Goſpels, the Hereticks have very many; ſuch as that according to the Egyptians, that according to the Twelve Apoſtles——Theſe we read, leſt we ſhould be thought ignorant.

[b] De Præſcript. adverſ. Hæretic. c. 30.——Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 13.
[c] Homil. 2. in Gen. vi.
[d] Hæreſ. 44.
[e] De Hæreſ. ad Quodvultd. N. 23. in Apell. See alſo Dr. Cave's Hiſt. Liter. and Spanheim Hiſt. Chriſt. Secul. II. c. 6.
[f] Homil. in Luc. i. 1. in init.

2. By

2. By Ambroſe [g].

Multi Evangelia ſcribere conati, quæ boni Nummularii non probaverunt. Unum autem tantummodo in quatuor libros digeſtum ex omnibus arbitrati ſunt eligendum; & aliud quidem fertur, quod duodecim ſcripſiſſe dicuntur. Auſus eſt etiam Baſilides ſcribere quod dicitur ſecundum Baſilidem———Legimus, ne legantur; legimus, ne ignoremus; legimus, non ut teneamus, ſed repudiemus, & ut ſciamus qualia ſint in quibus Magnifici iſti cor exultent ſuum.

Many have endeavoured to write Goſpels, which the Catholic Church hath not approved, but hath determined to make choice of four only. There is indeed a Goſpel ſpread up and down, ſaid to be written by the Twelve Apoſtles. Baſilides wrote another called by his name——. Theſe we read, that they may not be read; we read them, that we may not ſeem ignorant; we read them, not that we receive, but reject them, and may know what thoſe things are, of which the Hereticks make ſuch boaſting.

3. By Jerome, in the paſſage juſt now produced [h]. He reckons the Goſpel according to the Twelve Apoſtles among thoſe, which occaſioned hereſies in the Church, and which were wrote by men deſtitute of the ſpirit and grace of God, without a due regard to truth.

4. By the ſame, in his Dialogues againſt the Pelagians [i], introducing Atticus diſputing againſt the Opinion, That the baptiſed could not fall into ſin, and at length citing this Goſpel to that purpoſe, in the following words:

In Evangelio juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico Syroque ſermone, ſed Hebraicis literis ſcriptum eſt, quo utuntur uſque

In the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, which is written in the Chaldee and Syriack language, but in Hebrew

[g] Comment. in Luc. in init.
[h] See above Numb. IV.
[i] Lib. 3. Epiſt. 17. in init.

que hodiè Nazareni, ſecundum Apoſtolos, ſive, ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthæum, quod in Cæſarienſi bibliotheca habetur; narrat hiſtoria, &c.

letters, which the Nazarenes to this day uſe [and is called the Goſpel] according to the [twelve] Apoſtles, or, as moſt think, according to Matthew, and which is in the library of Cæſarea; there is the following hiſtory, &c.

I omit here producing the fragments of this Goſpel, and making any critical remarks upon it, becauſe I ſhall have a more convenient place of doing this, when I come to diſcourſe concerning the Goſpel according to the Nazarenes, which appears very evidently, by this paſſage of Jerome, to have been the very ſame with this Goſpel according to the Twelve Apoſtles.

CHAP. VIII.

An Account of the Goſpel of Barnabas, mentioned by Pope Gelaſius. Two ſuppoſed Fragments. Large Fragments of an Italian Goſpel under the Name of Barnabas, now in the Poſſeſſion of Prince Eugene. It appears evidently a late Mahometan Impoſture.

B.

Numb. VI. The GOSPEL of BARNABAS.

THIS Book does not appear to have fallen within the cognizance of any of the Chriſtian writers of the firſt four centuries; only it is thus mentioned in the famous Decree of Pope Gelaſius I. above produced, Numb. III. *The Goſpel under the name of Barnabas is Apocryphal.* There are not, I believe, any fragments of it extant, at leaſt not within my time, unleſs that be ſuppoſed to be one, which we find in Clemens

Clemens Alexandrinus [a], who having cited theſe words of the Pſalmiſt (Pſal. cxviii. 19, 20.) *Open to me the gates of righteouſneſs, and I will go into them, and I will praiſe the Lord. This is the gate of the Lord, into which the righteous ſhall enter*: he adds, Barnabas expounding this ſaying of the Prophet, thus reaſons:

Πολλῶν πυλῶν ἀνεῳγυιῶν, ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὕτη ἐστὶν, ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾗ μακάριοι πάντες οἱ εἰσελθόντες.

Although there are many gates opened, righteouſneſs is that gate, which is in Chriſt, at which all they that enter ſhall be bleſſed.

This paſſage, attributed by Clemens Alexandrinus to Barnabas, is indeed in the firſt Epiſtle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, §. 48. and therefore Dr. Grabe [b] ſuppoſes, that Clemens Alexandrinus was miſtaken in citing it out of Barnabas, becauſe it is not in the Epiſtle which goes under his name; which is indeed probable enough, not only becauſe the paſſage is exactly the ſame in Clement's Epiſtle, but becauſe it does not appear that any Goſpel under the name of Barnabas was known in the world, either in the time of Clemens Alexandrinus, or a long time afterwards.

The learned Dr. Grabe, out of an antient manuſcript, has indeed produced a ſaying attributed there to Barnabas, which he ſuppoſes to have been taken out of the Goſpel of Barnabas, mentioned by Pope Gelaſius [c]. The fragment is this, as he has given it us out of the thirty-ninth Baroccian manuſcript in the Bodleian:

Βαρνάβας ὁ ἀπόστολος ἔφη, Ἐν ἀμίλλαις πονηραῖς ἀθλιώτερος ὁ νικήσας, διότι ἐπέρχεται πλέον ἔχων τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

Barnabas the Apoſtle ſaith, He who prevails in unlawful conteſts, is ſo much the more unhappy, becauſe he goes away having more ſin.

[a] Stromat. l. 6. p. 646.
[b] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 303.
[c] Ibid. p. 302, 303.

Whether

Whether or no this paſſage is really a fragment of the antient Apocryphal Goſpel under the name of Barnabas, ſeems to me very uncertain. The author of the manuſcript (which is a common-place book made after the modern alphabetical manner) does not mention the name of any Goſpel from whence he took it; nor has the Doctor, who produces it, given any reaſons to ſupport his conjecture, and therefore we may as fairly conclude it to have been taken from the Epiſtle under the name of Barnabas, as from the Goſpel; and though it be not now to be found in any part of that Epiſtle, yet I cannot ſee why it may not be ſuppoſed to have been in that part of it which is loſt, ſince it is certain we have it now not complete[a]: and I am the rather apt to imagine this, becauſe we cannot diſcover any intimations or citations of this Goſpel in the antient writers, whereas the Epiſtle was well known, and frequently referred to.

I can ſcarce tell, whether it be worth while to obſerve, that Mr. Toland, in his late trifling book, which he calls Nazarenus, finding it very much to his purpoſe, endeavours to confirm the aforeſaid conjecture of Dr. Grabe[b]. He tells us, that in an Italian manuſcript, which he ſaw in Holland, and which is now in the library of Prince Eugene, entitled, *The true Goſpel of Jeſus, called Chriſt, a new Prophet ſent by God to the World, according to the relation of Barnabas the Apoſtle.* In this, I ſay, he tells us, he found the paſſage (juſt above produced out of the Baroccian manuſcript) almoſt in terms, and the ſenſe evidently there in more than one place. It is not my buſineſs to make here any remarks concerning this pretended Goſpel of Barnabas; it is enough to obſerve, that it is a very late and notorious Mahometan impoſture, as appears ſufficiently by the ſcraps of it which Mr. Toland has produced, and more fully by the large citations out of it, which are given us by La Monnoy[c], who had by Baron Hohendorf, Prince Eugene's adjutant-general, the ſight of the manuſcript; and as he ſeems to have given a more juſt and full account of it

[a] See Dr. Mangey's Remarks on Mr. Toland's Nazarenus, c. 4. p. 22.

[b] Nazaren. c. 2. p. 8. and c. 7. p. 20.

[c] Animadverſ. ad Menagian. apud Fabric. tom. 3. p. 373.

than

than Mr. Toland, ſo I verily believe he had more opportunity to do it [a]. It is probable the curioſity of ſome readers may be ſuch, as to deſire theſe fragments in our language, for whoſe ſake, though it be a digreſſion from my propoſed method, I ſhall inſert them here, as I find them in either of the foremen-tioned authors.

The title is, as above,

" The true Goſpel of Jeſus, called Chriſt, a new Prophet " ſent by God to the world, according to the relation of " Barnabas the Apoſtle [b]."

The firſt words of the book are theſe:

" Barnabas, an Apoſtle of Jeſus of Nazareth, called Chriſt, " to all thoſe who dwell upon the earth, wiſheth peace and " conſolation [c].

" He declares he was commanded to write this Goſpel; " repreſents himſelf as one of the Apoſtles, very familiar with " Jeſus Chriſt and the Virgin, better inſtructed than Paul " concerning the deſign of circumciſion, and the uſage of " meats, either allowed or forbid to the faithful.

" He aſſerts, the infernal torments of the Mahometans " ſhall not be everlaſting.

" Jeſus Chriſt is never called any more than a Prophet [d].

" It informs us, that the very moment the Jews were " preparing to go and take Chriſt in the garden of Olives, " he was taken up into the third heavens, by the miniſtry of " the four angels, Gabriel, Michael, Raphael, and Uriel; " that he ſhould not die until the end of the world, and that

[a] For I much queſtion whether Mr. Toland had, or made much uſe of the MS. otherwiſe he need not have been obliged to have tranſlated La Monnoy, as he does in his Appendix.

[b] Nazaren. p. 15.

[c] Ibid.

[d] Barnabé, qui ſe dit chargé de l'écrire, y paſſe pour un Apôtre familier avec Jeſus Chriſt, & avec la Vierge, mieux inſtruit que Paul du mérite de la circonciſion, & de l'uſage des viandes accordées ou défendues aux fideles. On y voit, que les peines infernales des Mahometans ne ſeront pas éternelles. Jéſus Chriſt n'y eſt appellé ſimplement que Prophète. La Monnoy loc. cit. p. 376, 377.

" it was Judas who was crucified inſtead of him, God per-
" mitting that this traitor ſhould appear to the eyes of the
" Jews ſo very like to Jeſus Chriſt, that they apprehended
" him inſtead of him, and as ſuch delivered him to Pilate;
" that the reſemblance between them was ſo great, that the
" Virgin Mary and the Apoſtles were even deceived, but that
" afterwards Jeſus Chriſt had obtained of God premiſſion to
" come and comfort them [a]."

What paſſed after this, we ſhall find in the following fragment, for which we are alſo obliged to Mr. La Monnoy, as well as the former.

A large Fragment of the GOSPEL of BARNABAS [b].

" The Virgin returned to Jeruſalem together with the
" author (Barnabas), James and John, upon the ſame day in
" which the decree of the high prieſt came forth. The Virgin,
" who feared God, although ſhe knew the injuſtice of the high
" prieſt's decree, gave a charge to all her particular acquaint-
" ance (or family), that they would forget her Son. But
" God, who is acquainted with the temper of all men's minds,
" knew how we and the mother of Jeſus were very miſerably
" diſtreſſed between ſorrow for the death of Judas (whom we
" believed to have been Jeſus our maſter) and expectations of
" ſeeing him riſen again from the dead. The guardian angels
" therefore of the Virgin Mary aſcended into the third hea-
" ven, where Jeſus was in the ſociety of angels, and related
" to him all the affair. Hereupon Jeſus intreated God, that he
" would permit him to go and ſee his mother and his Diſciples.
" Then God, being merciful, commanded four of his moſt
" beloved angels, viz. Gabriel, Michael, Raphael and Uriel,
" that they ſhould carry Jeſus to his mother's houſe, and
" there be his guard for three ſucceſſive days, and ſuffer no
" perſons to ſee him, who did not believe his doctrine. So

[a] La Monnoy loc. cit. p. 376, 377.

[b] Not underſtanding thoroughly the Italian itſelf, I am obliged in this Engliſh tranſlation to follow and depend upon the Latin one of Mr. Fabritius.

" Jeſus,

" Jeſus, encircled with glory, came into the parlour, wherein
" were Mary the Virgin, with her two ſiſters, Martha, with
" Mary Magdalen, Lazarus, with the author (Barnabas), and
" John, with James and Peter; who, when they ſaw him,
" fell down on the ground almoſt dead with the ſurpriſe.
" Whereupon Jeſus, lifting up his mother and the reſt of
" them from the ground, ſaid, *Fear not, for I am Jeſus;*
" *mourn not, for I am alive, and not dead.* But ſtill they all
" ſtood perfectly aſtoniſhed at the ſight of Jeſus, whom they
" really believed to have been dead. At length the Virgin
" very mournfully addreſſed herſelf to him, and ſaid, *I be-*
" *ſeech you, my ſon, how came it to paſs, that ſince God had*
" *given you power of raiſing up the dead to life, he ſhould per-*
" *mit you to be ſo betrayed to death, to the diſgrace of your re-*
" *lations and friends, as well as the reproach of your doctrine,*
" *inaſmuch as all that had any kindneſs for you were aſtoniſhed*
" *even almoſt unto death?* Then Jeſus embracing his mother,
" ſaid, *Believe me, my mother, for I poſitively affirm that I*
" *was never dead, for God has reſerved me even to the end of*
" *the world.* When he had thus ſaid, he deſired the four an-
" gels that they would ſhew themſelves, and teſtify how the
" whole affair was managed. The angels then appeared like
" four ſuns in their greateſt brightneſs, whereupon they all
" fell down again upon the ground at the ſurprize, as perſons
" that were dead. Then Jeſus gave them four linen cloths,
" that being covered with them, his mother and the reſt of
" the company might be able to bear the ſight of them, and
" hear them ſpeak. Lifting them then all from the ground,
" he encouraged them, and ſaid, *Theſe are the miniſters of*
" *God, Gabriel, who carries and delivers the ſecret meſſages*
" *of God; Michael, who battles againſt the enemies of God;*
" *Raphael, who takes charge of the ſouls of them who die;*
" *Uriel, who on the laſt day ſhall gather all to judgment.*
" Then the angels declared to the Virgin (that which God
" had commanded them by Jeſus) how that Judas was tranſ-
" formed [into the likeneſs of Jeſus] that ſo himſelf might
" ſuffer the puniſhment, which he deſigned to have brought
" upon another. Hereupon the author (Barnabas) ſpake,

" and ſaid, *Maſter, may I have the ſame liberty of propoſing a* " *queſtion to you now, which I heretofore had when you con-* " *verſed with us?* Jeſus anſwered, *Barnabas, propoſe what* " *queſtions you have a mind, and I will reply to them.* The " author (Barnabas) then ſaid, *O my maſter, ſince God is mer-* " *ciful, why would he ſo torment us, and make us to believe you* " *were really dead, and your mother to grieve almoſt to death?* " *And as to yourſelf, who are the holy one of God, why would* " *God permit you to be brought under ſuch diſgrace, as though* " *you had been executed with felons in mount Calvary?* Jeſus " anſwered, *Oh, Barnabas, believe me, every ſin, though it be* " *a ſmall one, is very ſeverely puniſhed by God, to whom it is* " *offenſive. Inaſmuch therefore as my mother and my faithful* " *diſciples loved me with ſome mixture of earthly love, the right-* " *eous God was pleaſed now to puniſh them for that love, that* " *they might not hereafter ſuffer for it in the flames of hell.* " *And as for my part, although I lived a very blameleſs life in* " *the world, yet ſince men called me God, and the ſon of God,* " *it pleaſed God, in order to prevent my being mocked by devils* " *in the judgment day, that I ſhould ſuffer diſgrace in this* " *world by the death of Judas, all men being perſuaded that I* " *really died on the croſs. Wherefore this reproach ſhall laſt* " *till the coming of Mahomet, who, when he ſhall come into the* " *world, will deliver all thoſe who believe the law of God from* " *this error.*"

In another part of this Goſpel, Mahomet is expreſsly named for the Paraclete or Comforter promiſed to come, John xiv. 16, 26. and xvi. 7. and in ſeveral places foretold as the deſigned accompliſher of God's œconomy towards men. It is, in ſhort, ſays Mr. Toland[a], the antient Ebionite or Nazarene ſyſtem, *as to the making Jeſus a mere man (though not with them the ſon of Joſeph, but divinely conceived by the Virgin Mary), and agrees in every thing almoſt with the ſcheme of our modern Unitarians, excepting the hiſtory of his death and reſurrection, about which a very different account is given from that in our Goſpels, but perfectly conformable to the tradition of the*

[a] Nazaren. p. 16.

Mahometans,

Mahometans, who maintain that another was crucified in his ſtead, and that Jeſus ſlipping through the hands of the Jews, preached afterwards to his Diſciples, and then was taken into heaven.

The laſt words of this Goſpel are[a],

" Jeſus being gone (into heaven), the Diſciples ſcattered " themſelves into many parts of Iſrael, and of the reſt of the " world, and the truth being hated of Satan was perſecuted " by falſehood, as it ever happens. For certain wicked men, " under pretence of being Diſciples, preached that Jeſus was " dead, and not riſen again; others preached, that Jeſus was " truly dead, and riſen again; others preached, and ſtill " continue to preach, that Jeſus is the Son of God, among " which perſons Paul has been deceived. We therefore, ac- " cording to the meaſure of our knowledge, do preach to " thoſe who fear God, to the end they may be ſaved at the " laſt day of his divine judgment. Amen. The end of the " Goſpel."

I believe every impartial reader, upon a bare view of theſe fragments, will be ſoon perſuaded to conclude this ſome late Mahometan forgery, and therefore could not be the Goſpel under Barnabas's name which is rejected by Pope Gelaſius; nor need I make any farther remarks upon it, or Mr. Toland's unfair concluſions from it. This is very well done by Dr. Mangey; one thing only falls in my way, becauſe it relates to the paſſage which is above produced out of the Baroccian manuſcript. Mr. Toland affirms, *he found it almoſt in terms in this Mahometan Goſpel of Prince Eugene; and the ſenſe there in more places than one*, which, as he ſays, made him believe *this to be the ſame with the Goſpel anciently attributed to Barnabas*, though interpolated. A ſtrange inference indeed! Becauſe theſe words are in a Goſpel evidently the compoſure of ſome late Mahometan, under the name of Barnabas, therefore this Goſpel muſt be as old as Gelaſius's time at leaſt; i. e. a hundred and fifty years, or more, before the Mahometan religion

[a] Nazaren. p. 22.

was known in the world. But, for my part, I cannot but declare my ſuſpicion, that there is no ſuch paſſage as this in the Italian Goſpel; for, had it really been, Mr. Toland would not have omitted that which he thought ſo much to his purpoſe; and therefore conſidering that writer's frequent unfairneſs in all his writings, and his numerous attempts to impoſe upon his readers, where he thinks he can ſafely do it; I do not at all wonder, that Dr. Mangey does with the utmoſt aſſurance affirm, that his omitting this paſſage is a ſtrong preſumption that it was not in his copy, and that he has not given ſo good proofs of his ingenuity or ſkill in this matter, as to be believed upon his own bare aſſertion. Mr. Toland cannot think it hard, that any one ſhould believe this charge of the Doctor againſt him; becauſe in his Anſwer he has not ſaid one word to juſtify himſelf in this matter, nor to clear his reputation, attacked ſo ſeverely, and in ſo tender and valuable a part.

CHAP. IX.

A Conjecture concerning the true Original of the Goſpel of Barnabas, from a Hiſtory in the fifth Century.

HAVING in the preceding chapter given ſome account of the Goſpel of Barnabas, I ſhall cloſe it with a conjecture concerning its true original, which I found upon a known Hiſtory in the fifth century related by Theodorus Lector[a], Nicephorus[b], Suidas[c], and others, to this purpoſe: "That in the reign of the Emperor Zeno, the relicts of Bar- "nabas the Apoſtle and companion of Paul were found in "Cyprus under a tree called Ceratia[d], and upon the breaſt the "Goſpel of Matthew, wrote with Barnabas's own hand, on "account of which the inhabitants of Cyprus prevailed in their

[a] Collectan. l. 2. in ipſo init.
[b] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 16. c. 37.
[c] In voc. Θύϊνα.
[d] I know not how to tranſlate the Greek Κεράτια, and therefore have put the original name.

"conteſt

" conteſt with the Biſhop of Antioch, that their own metro-
" polis ſhould have an independent Biſhop, not ſubject to the
" juriſdiction of Antioch. The book was carried to the Em-
" peror, and very highly eſteemed by him, and put under a
" crown in his palace." Now I ſay, whether this is a true relation of fact, or otherwiſe, it ſeems clearly to intimate to us, what that Goſpel was, which went under the name of Barnabas in the time of Pope Gelaſius, viz. that it was no other than ſome interpolated corrupted Goſpel of St. Matthew.

If the fact was true, nothing can be more reaſonably ſuppoſed, than that this book ſhould afterwards be called the Goſpel of Barnabas; becauſe,

1. The book is ſaid to be written with Barnabas's own hand.

2. It perhaps was a tranſlation of St. Matthew, made by Barnabas into Latin, or the peculiar dialect of Cyprus. The Hiſtory informs us, that it was laid up in the Emperor's palace, and ſomething read out of it at certain ſeaſons of the year [a].

3. By virtue of this book, which received its virtue from Barnabas, the Cyprians carried their point againſt the claim of the Biſhop of Antioch for ſuperintendency. All which laid together ſeems to intimate very plainly, that this book would afterwards be called by the name of Barnabas, which was really St. Matthew's Goſpel.

Nor does the caſe alter, if we ſuppoſe this a fiction of the prieſts of Cyprus; for if the book really was a forgery, all the ſame things are ſuppoſed, and though they really did not find the relicts of Barnabas, yet ſome book they certainly produced, and then all that was ſaid in the former caſe may as well be ſaid here, and the ſame reaſons be aſſigned, why this Goſpel of St. Matthew, pretended to be found upon the breaſt of Barnabas, ſhould go under the name of Barnabas, as if it had been really found there.

That which confirms me in the preceding conjecture is, that we have no mention at all of any ſuch Goſpel before this

[a] I regard not Sigebertus's ſingle ſtory, that the book was Hebrew.

time;

time; but immediately after, Pope Gelaſius mentions and condemns it [a].

Since the firſt writing of this chapter, I have the pleaſure to obſerve, Dr. Mangey has a conjecture very near the ſame with this of mine [b]. But I think his opinion lies under this difficulty, that it ſuppoſes the book pretended to be found on Barnabas's breaſt, to be really St. Matthew's Goſpel (for ſome book there muſt be produced), and yet the very ſame which was afterwards condemned in the Council at Rome by the Decree attributed to Gelaſius, under the name of Barnabas, as Apocryphal. But to ſay no more of this Goſpel; whatever it was, it is certain it never was a Canonical book, by Prop. IV, V, VI.

CHAP. X.

A Book under the Name of Bartholomew, mentioned by the ſuppoſed Dionyſius the Areopagite, proved ſpurious. The Goſpel of Bartholomew: it ſeems to have been the ſame which was found by Pantænus in the Indies in the ſecond Century, and no other than the Goſpel of the Nazarenes.

Numb. VII. A Book attributed to BARTHOLOMEW the Apoſtle.

THAT there was formerly ſuch a book, I gather from that antient book which goes under the name of Dionyſius the Areopagite, who is in ſacred Hiſtory related to have been one of St. Paul's converts at Athens [c]. The paſſage I refer to is that in the begining of his firſt book of Myſtical Divinity [d].

[a] The Emperor Zeno reigned (including his exile) from the year of Chriſt 474, to the year 491. Gelaſius's Decree is commonly dated in the year 494.

[b] Remarks on Nazaren. c. 3. p. 14, 15.

[c] Act. xvii. 34.

[d] De Myſtic. Theol. l. 1. c. 1.

Οὗτω

Οὕτω γὲν ὁ θεῖος Βαρθολομαῖός φησι, καὶ πολλὴν τὴν θεολογίαν εἶναι, καὶ ἐλαχίστην, καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πλατὺ καὶ μέγα, καὶ αὖθις συντετμημένον.

The divine Bartholomew hath ſpoken to this purpoſe; viz. That divinity is both copious and conciſe; that the Goſpel is both broad and large, and alſo ſhort.

It may perhaps be imagined by ſome, as the the old Greek ſcholiaſt of Dionyſius thought, that this was not a citation out of any book of Bartholomew, but only a ſentence of his preſerved by tradition: but this ſeems very improbable, becauſe the author of the books, which are now extant under the name of Dionyſius the Areopagite, lived at ſo great a diſtance from the Apoſtles' time. The learned Daille has largely [a] demonſtrated the ſpuriouſneſs of the book, even to the ſatisfaction of his great adverſary Biſhop Pearſon [b], and, I think, of all learned men; though that prelate diſapproves of Monſieur Daille's making the writer ſo very late as the year 520, and has made it evident that he wrote about the ſame time as Euſebius; and therefore this paſſage becomes conſiderable here, falling within the fourth century. But whichſoever of theſe periods we affix to this pretended Dionyſius, it is hardly probable ſuch a paſſage ſhould be preſerved in memory ſo long; and therefore either this author forged this ſentence out of his own brain, which he aſcribed to Bartholomew, and found it in no book, which Mr. Daille ſuppoſes [c], or elſe he took it out of ſome piece, ſaid to be the writing of that Apoſtle. Sixtus Senenſis [d], Dr. Grabe [e], and ſome others, ſuppoſe it to be taken out of the book entitled *The Goſpel of Bartholomew*, concerning which opinion I am not able to determine; nor indeed is it of any great account, whence the author of ſo groſs a forgery made his citations: I ſhall only obſerve, that the language of the fragment is no way like the language of the Apoſtolick age; for

[a] De Pſeudepig. Dionyſ. Areopag. lib. 1.

[b] Vindic. Ignat. Epiſtol. Par. 1. cap. 10. in init.

[c] Lib. cit. c. 27. in init.

[d] Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. p. 42.

[e] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 128.

inſtance,

inſtance, the word Θεολογία (*Theology*) was in that early time unknown, and did not, till of a long time after, come in uſe in the Church, and as the word Θεολόγος being conſtantly uſed in this book under the name of Dionyſius, does ſufficiently demonſtrate it to be a forgery of times much later than thoſe of the *true Dionyſius of Athens* [a]; ſo *à fortiori* does the word Θεολογία prove this writing under the name of Bartholomew to be much later than the time wherein the true Bartholomew lived. It is therefore to be judged Apocryphal by Prop. X, XII. as well as by Prop. IV, V, VI.

Numb. VIII. The GOSPEL of BARTHOLOMEW.

This is mentioned,

1. By Jerome [b]: *Many have endeavoured*, ſays he, *without the grace and ſpirit of God, to ſet forth Goſpels, among which is that under the name of Bartholomew.*

2. By Pope Gelaſius [c]: *The Goſpel under the name of Bartholomew the Apoſtle, is Apocryphal.* There is not any other expreſs mention, that I know, of this book; ſo that it is evidently to be reckoned among the Apocryphal ones, by Prop. IV, V, VI.

There are not any fragments extant of this book, unleſs, as I am inclined to think, it was the very ſame with the Goſpel of St. Matthew, which the Hebrews or Nazarenes made uſe of. The reaſon of my conjecture is, the account we have both from Euſebius [d] and Jerome [e], viz. *That Pantænus, being ſent by Demetrius Biſhop of Alexandria to preach the Goſpel to the Indians, at the requeſt of their ambaſſadors, when he came among them, found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve Apoſtles, had preached the Goſpel among them before, according to the Goſpel of St. Matthew, which he left there in Hebrew characters; and*, as Jerome adds, *brought it back with him to*

[a] Dr. Grabe, ibid.

[b] Præfat. in Comm. in Matt. See the paſſage at large above, Num. IV.

[c] In his Decree; ſee it at large above, Num. III.

[d] Hiſtor. Eccleſ. l. 5. c. 10.

[e] Catalog. Virg. Illuſtr. in Pantæn.

Alexandria.

Alexandria. Now this, I ſay, ſeems to me to have been the book afterwards called *The Goſpel of Bartholomew*, only that it had ſuffered many interpolations and additions. For it cannot be thought improbable, that thoſe who heard St. Bartholomew preach over and explain this Goſpel to them, ſhould, after his departure, rather call it by his name, whom they knew, than the name of Matthew, whom they knew not. Beſides, if we may credit Nicephorus [a], he aſſures us, *that Bartholomew dictated the Goſpel of Matthew to them out of his memory, and did not bring it along with him*; and, if ſo, it is very improbable they ſhould call it by any other name beſides his.

Nor is there room to object, that it cannot be ſuppoſed this book ſhould be among the Indians without any title: for,

1. If Nicephorus's relation be true, *there would be no neceſſity of a title*; his dictating it to them was ſufficient to entitle it. But,

2. If we ſay he brought it with him to the Indies, *it is not at all ſtrange it ſhould be left without a title.* Bartholomew himſelf knew who the author was, and ſo perhaps did not write any. But I need not fly to any conjectures in the matter; I dare aſſert, and undertake to prove, that the preſent titles of our four Goſpels, as well as many other antient books, were not prefixed to them by their authors [b]. As to the titles of the Goſpels, all I offer at preſent is, the exact likeneſs or uniformity of their titles, the difference that is between the Greek and Latin copies in this reſpect, and the difference of the old Syriack Verſion from both.

Hence it ſeems probable, this Goſpel of Bartholomew was that of Matthew, which he left, and Pantænus found in the Indies: I add, it received many interpolations and additions, ſome few perhaps by Bartholomew himſelf (by way of commentary or illuſtrating notes, which afterwards crept into the text), but more, and of a different ſort, by others; otherwiſe Jerome and Gelaſius would not have condemned it as Apo-

[a] Hiſtor. Eccl. l. 4. c. 32.

[b] He who has a mind may ſee this proved by Father Simon, Crit. Hiſtory of the New Teſt. chap. 2.

cryphal.

cryphal. And, if I may be allowed to gueſs, I would offer it as probable, that when Pantænus brought it to Alexandria, it had at length inſerted into it the interpolations of the Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew, which the Judaizing Chriſtians there made uſe of. Two things make this conjecture more probable, viz.

1. *Becauſe it was in Hebrew characters*, and ſo of courſe falling into the hands of the Jewiſh converts, it cannot be thought but they would endeavour to make it as like their own Hebrew copy of St. Matthew as they could, otherwiſe their own muſt have been cenſured as a ſpurious and Apocryphal piece.

2. Becauſe the Nazarene Goſpel (or the Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew) *ſeems at this time to have been more in uſe at Alexandria, than any other part of the world.* It is well known, what number of Jews, or Judaizing Chriſtians, inhabited that city; and that theſe uſed this Hebrew Goſpel, is evident, becauſe it was known to Clemens Alexandrinus, the ſcholar of the above-mentioned Pantænus, and Origen, the ſcholar of Clemens, who both dwelt at Alexandria; beſides whom, it does not appear that any Chriſtian writer (except Hegeſippus) knew any thing of this Goſpel, till Jerome. This I offer as a probable conjecture concerning this book[a]. I know but one thing can be objected, and that is, *how Jerome, who ſaw and read the Hebrew Goſpel of the Nazarenes, could ſpeak of this Goſpel of Bartholomew as diſtinct from it, which he certainly does.* To which I think it will be enough to anſwer, that it is very probable Jerome had never ſeen any Goſpel under Bartholomew's name, but only rejects it, as what he knew was commonly eſteemed a ſpurious piece.

I have only here to add, that if the foregoing account be juſt, Monſieur Daille[b] is very much miſtaken in ſuppoſing that the Goſpel of Bartholomew was forged but a very little time before Gelaſius. Nor is his reaſon true which he offers,

[a] Dr. Grabe propoſes this conjecture in part, Spicil. Patr. tom. 1. p. 128.

[b] De Pſeudepig. Dion. Areopag. c. 27.

viz.

viz. *Because it is neither mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, nor any of the antient writers*; for that it was long before mentioned by Jerome in the place above cited, every one may perceive.

CHAP. XI.

The Gospel of Basilides: his Age and Tenets: his Twenty-four Books upon the Gospel.

Numb. IX. The GOSPEL of BASILIDES.

CONCERNING this Gospel we have very little account in any Christian Histories; it is only just named among the Apocryphal books of the New Testament:

1. By Origen[a]: *The Church hath but four Gospels, the hereticks many——Basilides was so impudent as to write a Gospel, and prefix his own name to it.*

2. By Ambrose[b]: *Many have attempted to write Gospels, which the Orthodox do not approve——Basilides had the impudence to write one, which is called* The Gospel according to Basilides.

3. By Jerome[c]: *Many have endeavoured without the grace and spirit of God to publish Gospels, among which is that of Basilides, &c.*

There are not now any fragments of this Gospel any where extant, nor am I able to make any conjecture concerning it; besides that it was calculated to promote the heterodox sentiments of its author; of which it may not be foreign to my purpose to give the following account.

He was one of the first noted hereticks of the Christian Church, and lived very near the Apostles' times, though the

[a] Ecclesia quatuor habet Evangelia, Hæreses plurima——Ausus est Basilides scribere Evangelium, & suo illud nomine titulare. Homil. in Luc. i. 1. in init.

[b] See the passage at length above, Num. V. in Luc. i.

[c] Præfat. in Comment. in Matth. produced at large above, Num. IV.

precise

preciſe time of his age has been much diſputed by Biſhop Pearſon [a] againſt Daille [b]. He was the ſcholar of Menander, and one of the main authors of the known ſect of the Gnoſticks, *à quo Gnoſtici*, ſays Euſebius in his *Chronicon* [c]. His principal tenets were,

That there was only one being or creature made by God; this being formed the next, and that another, and ſo on, in a ridiculous ſeries of Gods or angels proceeding from each other, to the number of 365, *each of which created a heaven to anſwer to the number of the days of the year, over which he preſided. That the angel who preſided in that heaven which is neareſt to us, made this earth and its inhabitants; that the angel, or God of the Jews was more obſtinate than the reſt, and endeavoured to make that people ſuperior to all other; at which the angels of other nations being provoked, incited their reſpective countries to wage war with the Jews; that the unbegotten Father ſent his Son, in the ſhape of a man, to prevent the Jewiſh tyranny; that he was not really fleſh, or a man, but only appeared to be ſo; that he did not himſelf ſuffer on the croſs, but Simon the Cyrenian in his ſtead. He denied the reſurrection, allowed of the Pythagorean tranſmigration of ſouls, of ſodomy, and all ſorts of uncleanneſs, &c.* He that would read more of this ſort may conſult Irenæus [d], Tertullian [e], Clemens Alexandrinus [f], Euſebius [g], Epiphanius [h], Jerome [i], and Auſtin [k] among the antients; Mr. Spanheim (who has obliged the world with a ſpecimen of their images and magical hieroglyphicks, neatly engraved on copper plates [l]) and Dr. Grabe among the moderns [m].

I have been the more large in reciting the tenets of Baſilides, becauſe it may perhaps be not abſurd to ſuppoſe them

[a] Vindic. Ignat. Epiſt. par. 2. c. 7.
[b] De Pſeudepig. Dion. & Ignat. l. 2. c. 10.
[c] Ad ann. Chriſti 136.
[d] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 23, &c. & l. 2. c. 65.
[e] De Præſcript. adv. Hæret. c. 46.
[f] In the third and fourth books of his Stromata, he is often refuted.
[g] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 7.
[h] Hæreſ. 24.
[i] Catal. Vir. Illuſtr. in Agrippa Caſtor.
[k] De Hæreſ. ad Quodvultd. n. 4.
[l] Eccl. Hiſt. Secul. II. p. 638, 639.
[m] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 2. p. 35, &c.

as

as ſo many fragments of his Goſpel. Euſebius [a] tells us of an excellent piece wrote by Agrippa Caſtor, wherein he confuted all the ſubtle principles of this impious heretick, and mentions his *having wrote twenty-four books upon the Goſpel*; but whether he means upon either or all the Goſpels which we now have, or upon his own Goſpel, is utterly uncertain. Valeſius [b], and after him Dr. Cave [c] and Dr. Grabe [d] ſuppoſe it to have been his own Goſpel, and not any of ours, which is indeed much the more probable opinion; for it cannot be imagined that Hereſiarch would ſhew ſo great reſpect to ours. But perhaps neither of theſe opinions is true, but rather that the twenty-four books upon the Goſpel, which Agrippa Caſtor ſpeaks of, were the very Goſpel of Baſilides itſelf, which Origen and Jerome mention in the places above cited. There are indeed ſome conſiderable fragments of this work in Clemens Alexandrinus [e], which becauſe I cannot certainly prove to have been the Goſpel of Baſilides, I ſhall think it ſufficient to refer the reader to, as they are collected by the learned writer laſt mentioned.

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 7. Εἰς μὲν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τέσσαρα πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι συντάξας βιβλία.

[b] Annot. in loc. Euſ. jam citat. p. 62.

[c] Hiſt. Literar. p. 30.

[d] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 2. p. 37, 38.

[e] Strom. l. 4. p. 506, &c. There is alſo another Fragment of it in the Diſputation of Archelaus and Manes publiſhed at Rome by Laurentius Alexander Zacagnius, Library-keeper of the Vatican. See Grab. loc. cit.

CHAP. XII.

The Goſpel of Cerinthus; his Age and Principles. A Story of St. John the Apoſtle and him at Epheſus. That he is referred to Acts xv. *His Goſpel proved to be the very ſame with the Goſpel of the Ebionites and Nazarenes.*

C.

Numb. X. The GOSPEL of CERINTHUS.

THIS is mentioned only by Epiphanius under this name, though under other names by ſeveral of the firſt writers, as will appear hereafter. He mentions it upon the ſame occaſion as many other of the Chriſtian writers do the Apocryphal books; viz. expounding the firſt words of St. Luke's Goſpel [a].

Φάσκων, ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν, ἵνα τινὰς μὲν ἐπιχειρητὰς δείξῃ, φημὶ δὲ τὸς περὶ Κήρινθον, καὶ Μήρινθον, καὶ ἄλλους.

Saying, *foraſmuch as many have taken in hand*, by which he would intimate, that there had been many undertakers of the like work, among which, I ſuppoſe, were Cerinthus, Merinthus, and others.

That which makes it worth while critically to enquire into this Goſpel is, that it ſeems to follow from theſe words of Epiphanius, that he thought *it was compoſed before St. Luke wrote his*, and that the hereticks, againſt whom he is in that chapter writing, maintained, that the *Goſpel which is received as St. John's was written by this ſame Cerinthus.*

In order to introduce what I conjecture concerning this matter, I ſhall firſt premiſe ſome account of Cerinthus and his tenets. He appears to have been one of the firſt who troubled the Chriſtian Church with his heretical opinions; for, if we

[a] Anoëtorum ſeu Alogorum, Hæreſ. 51. §. 7.

may

may credit Irenæus [a], St. John *wrote his Goſpel with this particular view, that he might confute the errors which were ſpread abroad by Cerinthus*; and in another place [b] he tells us, *that there were ſome in being in his time, who heard Polycarp a companion of the ſaid Apoſtle relate the following ſtory*, viz. "That when "St. John was in a certain bath at Epheſus, and ſaw Cerin-"thus alſo in, he immediately leaped out of the bath, ſaying, "Let us go away, leſt the bath ſhould fall down, in which "is Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth." Epiphanius [c] adds, *that he made frequent oppoſition to the Apoſtles themſelves at Antioch, Cæſarea, and Jeruſalem; that he was one of thoſe condemned in the Council of Jeruſalem*, Acts xv. *and referred to in the Synodical Letter to the Church of Antioch*, ver. 24. *as one who had troubled them with words ſubverting their ſouls, &c. That he reproached St. Peter for going to Cornelius a Gentile, and other uncircumciſed perſons, and St. Paul upon the very ſame account at Jeruſalem.* His principal tenets were the ſame with the Carpocratians and Ebionites, a few of which, as far as they are ſerviceable to my deſign, I ſhall mention; viz. *He denied the divinity of our Saviour, aſſerting that Jeſus was but a mere man, not born of a Virgin, but of Mary, begotten by Joſeph in the ordinary way of generation; that circumciſion and the other rites of the Moſaick law were ſtill in force and obligatory upon Chriſtians.* This ſhort account of this heretick and his principles does very plainly intimate, what we are to determine concerning the Goſpel now under conſideration, to which his name was prefixed, viz. *That it was either entirely the ſame, or very little different from the Goſpel of the Ebionites or Nazarenes, which was moſt certainly calculated to theſe ſentiments*, as will appear hereafter, and was no other than St. Matthew's Goſpel tranſlated into Hebrew, with diverſe interpolations and corruptions. This conjecture will appear probable to thoſe who conſider,

1. *That the Cerinthians and Ebionites agreed in almoſt all the ſame heretical principles*, but chiefly *in maintaining the*

[a] Adv. Hæreſ. lib. 3. c. 11. p. 257.
[b] Lib. 3. c. 3. Vid. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 14.
[c] Hæreſ. 28. Cerinth. §. 2, 3.

continuing obligation of Moses's law, denying our Saviour's divinity, and asserting him to be a mere man. This has been already hinted, and will undeniably appear by a bare casting of the eye upon the places of Epiphanius cited at the bottom of the page [a].

2. Agreeable to these principles *they both received only St. Matthew's Gospel, rejecting the other parts of Scripture.* Concerning the Ebionites we have the testimony of Irenæus [b], but more large in Eusebius [c]: *They utterly reject all Paul's Epistles, styling him an apostate from the law, and receive only that which is called* The Gospel according to the Hebrews; i. e. *that under St. Matthew's name* [d]. As to the Cerinthians we are told the same, more than once, by Epiphanius; so Hæres. 28. *They receive only the Gospel of Matthew, &c.* and Hæres. xxx. §. 14. he expressly tells us (which puts the matter past all doubt) that they received the same Gospel of Matthew as the Ebionites did, and that it was called *The Gospel according to the Hebrews.*

3. *The Gospel of St. Matthew, which Cerinthus and the Ebionites made use of, was in the very same respects altered and corrupted*; for instance, the genealogy of our Saviour, and some more in the beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel, were left out in the copies of both these hereticks. As to the Ebionites, it is expressly asserted by Epiphanius [e], *In the Gospel which they use, and which they call by Matthew's name, and the Hebrew Gospel; which is not perfect, but adulterated and imperfect, &c.* And as to the Cerinthians no less evidently in the place above cited [f]: *They use only the Gospel of Matthew in part, but not the whole of it; for they have taken away the genealogy of our Saviour according to the flesh out of their Gospel:* which that the Ebionites did also, appears from what the same author says in another place [g]; having produced a passage out of the Gospel of the Ebionites according to Matthew, he adds, Cerinthus and Carpocras making use of the same Gospel of Mat-

[a] Compare Hæres. 28. and 30. together. See also Philastr. Hæres. 36. and August. de Hæres. N. 8.

[b] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 11. p.

[c] Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 27.

[d] Vid. Iren. loc. cit.

[e] Hæres. 30. §. 13.

[f] Hæres. 28. §. 5.

[g] Hæres. 30. §. 14.

thew

thew (as they call it) with the Ebionites——who have eraſed out of their copies the genealogy of Chriſt, and begin their Goſpel at theſe words, *And it came to paſs in the days of Herod the king* (Matt. iii. 1.). The deſign of their agreement to omit the genealogy, and the firſt and ſecond chapters, was, that their notion of Chriſt's being a mere man might not be contradicted and confuted, which they certainly had been, if the account there given of the Virgin's conception by the Holy Ghoſt was credited[a].

Upon the whole then, it ſeems not unfair to conclude, that the Goſpel of Cerinthus and his followers *was no other than the Ebionite or Nazarene Goſpel*, i. e. the Goſpel of St. Matthew corrupted and interpolated, in Hebrew. A farther account of this Goſpel, together with all its fragments, will be produced in its proper place, viz. under the title of *The Goſpel of the Nazarenes*. I ſhall only add farther here, that the antient hereticks, called the Alogi, aſcribed the Goſpel of John and the Revelations to Cerinthus, as the author of both; and upon that ſcore rejected them as Apocryphal[b]: but how abſurd this opinion was, Epiphanius has well ſhewn; and I ſhall endeavour to prove hereafter, viz. as to the Goſpel in the laſt part of this work, and as to the Revelation in the following chapter.

[a] It is to be obſerved, that though Epiphanius in the place laſt cited ſeems to intimate, that Cerinthus and Carpocras attempted to prove our Saviour to be a mere man from the genealogy, Matt. i. contrary to the Ebionites who reject it, yet he cannot mean that thoſe hereticks owned the genealogy, but only argued upon the ſuppoſition of its being true: for if otherwiſe, he muſt contradict himſelf in the other places cited.

[b] Hæreſ. 51. §. 3.

CHAP. XIII.

The Revelation of Cerinthus not the ſame with the Revelation of St. John, but compiled out of it; on which Account the Canonical Revelation was ſo long of doubtful Authority.

Numb. XI. The REVELATION of CERINTHUS.

THIS Apocryphal piece is only mentioned by Caius, or Gaius, a learned Preſbyter of Rome, in his diſputation againſt Proclus. The fragment is preſerved by Euſebius, out of whom I ſhall here tranſcribe it.

Ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήρινθος ὁ δι' Ἀποκαλύψεων, ὡς ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλε μεγάλε γεγραμμένων, τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος, ἐπεισάγει λέγων, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τῦ Χριστῦ, καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν. Καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τῦ Θεῦ, ἀριθμὸν χιλιονταετίας ἐν γάμῳ ἑορτῆς θέλων πλανᾶν λέγει γίνεσθαι. Vid. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 28.

Cerinthus in a book of Revelations written by him, as though he were ſome great Apoſtle, falſely tells us of certain ſurpriſing diſcoveries, which were made to him by angels, which he thus introduces, ſaying, That after the reſurrection Chriſt ſhall reign here on earth, and thoſe who dwell at Jeruſalem ſhall again ſerve (or be capable of) bodily luſts and pleaſures. To which that enemy of the divine Scriptures adds, the better to propagate his errors, that the ſpace of a thouſand years ſhall be ſpent in marriage-feaſting.

Hence it is evident that Caius knew of ſome book under the title of *The Revelation*, which pretended to inſpiration, as being dictated by angels, and wrote by Cerinthus, as ſome great Apoſtle; for I think nothing more juſt than Valeſius's tranſlation of thoſe words Ὡς ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλε μεγάλε γεγραμμένων, *a*

ſe

ſe tanquam a magno Apoſtolo conſcriptas, for otherwiſe it will not be poſſible to make any ſenſe of the ſentence. Dr. Grabe indeed imagines, that Caius aſcribed the Revelation of St. John to Cerinthus in the fore-cited paſſage, and meant no other than that this Canonical book was publiſhed by Cerinthus under the name of St. John[a]. But the fragment which Caius produces does moſt evidently demonſtrate the contrary, becauſe the contents of it, viz. *Chriſt's reigning on earth, the Jews then enjoying carnal luſts and pleaſures, and ſpending a thouſand years in nuptial merriments*, are no where found in the Revelation of St. John. It is true indeed (as that learned antiquary obſerves), Dionyſius Alexandrinus[b] intimates, *that it was the opinion of ſome, that no Apoſtle nor holy eccleſiaſtical writer wrote the Revelation called St. John's, but that Cerinthus forged it, and, the better to propagate his notions and gain credit to his fancies, prefixed the name of John to it.* He might have added too, that the hereticks called Alogi were *of this opinion*[c]: but all this will not prove what he contends for, that *The Revelations of St. John* and *Cerinthus* were the ſame book; for beſides what has been already obſerved out of the fragment of Caius to prove them diſtinct, it is evident Dionyſius Alexandrinus looked upon them as ſuch too; for though he endeavours to prove (what I hope hereafter to confute) that the *Revelation* under the name of *John the Divine*, or Apoſtle, was not wrote by him, but ſome other John, yet he declares his belief of it as the work ἀγίου τινος καὶ θεοπνεύστου, *of ſome holy and inſpired writer*; whereas he had a little before condemned the pretended Revelation of Cerinthus, and his doctrine which he calls Hereſy, and accordingly produces the following ſpecimen of his Revelations, as well deſerving to be exploded. See Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. l. 7. c. 25.

Τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτῷ τὸ δόγμα, ἐπίγειον εἶσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασι-

For this is the doctrine of Cerinthus, *that Chriſt ſhall reign here on earth*, when, as

[a] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 312.
[b] Lib. 2. de Promiſſ. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. c. 25. & l. 3. c. 28.
[c] Hæreſ. 51. §. 3.

λείαν, καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς ὠρέγετο, φιλοσώματος ὢν καὶ πάνυ σαρκικὸς, ἐν τούτοις ὀνειροπολεῖν ἔσεσθαι, γαστρὸς καὶ ταῖς ὑπὸ γαστέρα ὠλησμοναῖς, τουτέστι σιτίοις, καὶ ποτοῖς, καὶ γάμοις, καὶ δι' ὧν εὐφημότερον ταῦτα ᾠήθη ποριεῖσθαι, ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἱερείων σφαγαῖς.

he extravagantly fancied, *there ſhould be an enjoyment of thoſe luſts of the fleſh, to which himſelf was* exceſſively inclined and addicted, viz. *abundant proviſions for the belly and the parts——i. e. with meats and drinks, and marriages, for the better accompliſhing of which deſigns there ſhould be feaſtings, and banquetings, and killing of ſacrifices.*

Such a book was the Revelation of Cerinthus, ſufficiently different from that under the name of St. John now in the Canon, and undoubtedly to be eſteemed Apocryphal, by Prop. IV, V, VI, VIII, and IX.

If it ſhould be yet urged, that *it is very ſtrange*, that not only the Alogians, but others who lived before Dionyſius of Alexandria, and conſequently very near the time of St. John, *ſhould aſcribe his Book of Revelations to Cerinthus, as its author*, I ſhall only now anſwer,

Firſt, That we have very ſtrong reaſon to preſume *the Revelation*, now reputed Canonical, *was really wrote by him whoſe name it bears.*

Secondly, That from the foregoing account it ſeems very probable, that *the Revelation of Cerinthus was compiled out of that of St. John, with the addition of many trifling fancies, and perhaps the omiſſion of ſome things not ſo agreeable to the ſentiments of that heretick.* This I am the rather inclined to think; becauſe,

1. *This was a practice very common with the hereticks of thoſe early times of the Church, viz. to alter the genuine records of Chriſtianity, and to accommodate them to their own impious ſentiments, retaining only ſo much of the true writing, as would enable them with the greater confidence to impoſe their ſpurious pieces upon the world.* See above in this part, Chap. I. Obſerv. II. This has been already proved to be fact as to the Goſpel

Goſpel of Bartholomew and Barnabas, and will appear hereafter to be true of the Goſpel of the Ebionites, Nazarenes, Marcion, Peter, and others.

2. Becauſe this has been proved to be *the caſe in reſpect of the Goſpel of Cerinthus in the preceding chapter, viz. that it was an interpolated and corrupted copy of St. Matthew; and it is not ſtrange the ſame perſon ſhould be guilty of the ſame practice with the Revelation of St. John.*

3. Becauſe, ſuppoſing the Revelation of St. John to be genuine, *there can be no other cauſe more probable aſſigned, why it ſhould have been by ſo many attributed to Cerinthus.* Upon this hypotheſis of his altering it ſo much, it is not ſtrange if it was by his followers aſcribed to him as its author, and ſo by others; and ſo this being known, at length even the genuine book of St. John came, by ſome weaker perſons, who had not compared both, to be aſcribed to that heretick. This will yet ſeem farther probable, if we conſider the myſteriouſneſs of St. John's book, which is ſuch as would be a very likely means to give force to the common report of its being rather wrote by Cerinthus than St. John, eſpecially if we add this farther conſideration of its being wrote in a ſtyle very different from thoſe commonly received and acknowledged.

Coroll. Hence we may give at leaſt a probable account, why the Revelation of St. John was ſo long of doubtful authority in the Church, viz. becauſe it was unhappily interpolated by Cerinthus immediately after its firſt being publiſhed, and ſo by many attributed to him. That this was the plain reaſon why the Alogians rejected it, Epiphanius expreſsly tells us [a], and may fairly be concluded of others from what has been ſaid. Something like this is the conjecture of Grotius concerning this matter, with whoſe words (becauſe of the juſt reputation of the man) I will finiſh this chapter [b]. *I ſuppoſe,* ſays he, *the reaſon why there have been doubts concerning the author and authority of this book, among others* (there given), *is, becauſe what we read in it of the reſurrection, of the thouſand years, of Gog and Magog,* agrees in ſound with the Jewiſh

[a] Loc. jam cit. [b] Annot. in Titul. Apocalyps.

books;

books; and though they are here in a different ſenſe, yet were perverted by Cerinthus, and ſome Chriſtians, who judaized too much into a plain Jewiſh ſenſe. But of this more hereafter.

CHAP. XIV.

Books under the Name of Chriſt. None of this ſort mentioned till St. Auſtin's Time. A malicious Miſtake of Mr. Toland detected. An Epiſtle of Chriſt to Peter and Paul proved out of St. Auſtin to be a ridiculous Forgery. Another Book attributed to Chriſt. Concerning the Magick of Chriſt.

THE Books, which fall next in courſe under conſideration, are thoſe attributed to our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, which before I come particularly to conſider, I would premiſe, that *I have not found any mention of ſuch within the limits of my time*, i. e. in any writers of the firſt four centuries, *beſides by Auſtin*, except the *Epiſtle of Chriſt to Abgarus*, which is ſtill extant, and to be examined in the next part of this work. It is true indeed, in later ages, many ſuch forgeries are known to have been; ſome of which are ſtill extant, but ſo ridiculous and trifling, as not to deſerve any mention or regard. Mr. Fabritius has been at the pains (though to little purpoſe) to collect them in his Codex Apocryphus Novi Teſtamenti, where p. 308, &c. he who has a mind may ſee a more particular account. I return to what is more material: it does not appear that our Saviour ever wrote any book or letter whatſoever, except *what he wrote with his finger on the ground*[a], whilſt the Jews were accuſing the adulterous woman to him; concerning which writing I think it as needleſs to form any new conjecture of my own, as it would be trifling to give the reader the elaborate diſcourſes of Sixtus Senenſis[b], Fabritius[c], and others. Mr. Toland indeed in his Catalogue (Amyntor, p. 20.) under the title of Books reported to be written by

[a] John viii. 6.
[b] Bibliothec. Sanct. lib. 2. p. 70.
[c] Cod. Apoc. N. T. Pars 1. p. 315.

Chriſt

Chriſt himſelf, reckons one entitled *The Parables and Sermons of Chriſt*, as mentioned by Euſebius, Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39. At firſt view of this, one would be ready to conclude, that ſome ſuch book under this title there certainly was written by our Saviour, ſeeing it is mentioned by ſo credible an author as Euſebius. But let the reader obſerve here a plain inſtance either of the unfairneſs or blundering of that ſilly writer; for it is evident Euſebius never thought any thing of ſuch a book, either wrote by Chriſt, or that went under his name. The paſſage referred to is this; ſpeaking of Papias, and his fondneſs for traditions, he adds,

Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς συγγραφεὺς, ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφῳ εἰς αὐτὸν ἥκοντα, παραλέϑεται ξένας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τῦ Σωτῆρος, καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτῦ, καί τινα ἄλλα μυϑικώτερα, &c.

That writer farther declares, that he received many other things by oral tradition, viz. ſome ſtrange parables and diſcourſes of our Saviour, and ſuch like idle fabulous things, &c.

Among theſe one was the Millennium.

It is ſtrange Mr. Toland would either ſuffer himſelf to be ſo much impoſed upon, or endeavour to impoſe upon his readers a thing ſo very groſs, as to call that a book written by Chriſt, and cite Euſebius for it, when Euſebius expreſsly ſays, it was no book at all, but only ſome fabulous traditionary ſtories of Chriſt, which the credulous Papias had collected. I take it then for granted, that we have no mention of any books as written by our Saviour till the fourth century; which premiſed, I come to enquire, what mention is made of them there.

Numb.

Numb. XII. The EPISTLE of CHRIST to PETER and PAUL.

ST. AUSTIN diſputing againſt the Pagans intimates, that they pretended to have ſeen or read ſome books which were written by Chriſt. His words are theſe [a];

Ita vero iſti deſipiunt, ut in illis libris, quos eum ſcripſiſſe exiſtimant, dicant contineri eas artes, quibus eum putant ea feciſſe miracula, quorum fama ubique percrebuit;—— Quid quod etiam divino judicio ſic errant quidam eorum, qui talia Chriſtum ſcripſiſſe vel credunt, vel credi volunt, ut eoſdem libros ad Petrum et Paulum dicant, tanquam epiſtolari titulo prænotatos.

They are ſo ſtrangely infatuated, as to aſſert, that in thoſe books which they ſuppoſe Chriſt to have written, are contained thoſe arts, by which he wrought his celebrated miracles.——They are ſo blinded by the judgment of God upon them, who believe or would have others believe that Chriſt wrote ſuch books, as to ſay, that the books are wrote in the form of an *Epiſtle to Peter and Paul.*

It is not very difficult to form a judgment concerning theſe ſpurious pieces; and indeed the folly of them is ſo well demonſtrated by St. Auſtin, that I need do little more than give the reader his words. He firſt ſeems to queſtion the ſincerity of their relation as to the fact: " *If they have,* ſays he, *any* " *ſuch books which they affirm Chriſt to have written, let them* " *produce them to us. They muſt neceſſarily be very uſeful and* " *edifying books, which were written by one whom themſelves* " *eſteemed as a man of the greateſt wiſdom. If they are afraid* " *to produce them, it is a ſign they are bad; and if they* " *are bad, they could not be written by the wiſeſt of men; but* " *ſuch they confeſs Chriſt to have been, therefore Chriſt did not* " *write any ſuch book.*——A little after, *Why do not they who* " *affirm they have read ſuch books do ſome ſuch works, as they*

[a] De Conſenſ. Evang. Lib. 1. c. 9, 10. T. Opp. 4.

" *with*

" *with wonder own he did by them?*" In the reſt of the chapter this pious Father ſhews it impoſſible that this book ſhould not be a forgery, by this good argument, *that St. Paul was not a Chriſtian until a conſiderable time after Chriſt's aſcenſion, and ſo could not be joined with Peter, as a Diſciple of Chriſt, and receive a letter from him, unleſs it was ſent by poſt from heaven.*

It is manifeſt therefore this book muſt be reckoned Apocryphal and ſpurious by Prop. IV, V, and VI. as alſo by Prop. VIII. it containing things contrary to certainly known and undoubted truths, which being ſuch alſo as are ſubverſive of the whole deſign and doctrine of Chriſtianity, viz. That Chriſt wrought his miracles by magical arts [a], prove it Apocryphal by Coroll. Prop. VIII.

Whether this book was forged by a Heathen or a Chriſtian, is not very eaſy to determine. St. Auſtin ſuppoſes the latter [b]; which indeed ſeems the more probable conjecture, and becauſe it is a very ingenious one, it may be worth while to tranſcribe it. " Perhaps," ſays he, " it was the contrivance of " ſome, who fancied by writing ſuch books, under the names " of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, they could gain ſome weight " and authority from ſo glorious a name to theſe execrable " arts; but were ſo infatuated in their impudent impoſture, " as juſtly to expoſe themſelves to the laughter of children, " and thoſe who were only able to read *(in gradu lectorum)* " the Chriſtian books. For when they had reſolved to forge " ſuch a Letter under the name of Chriſt to his Apoſtles, " they contrived to inſcribe it to thoſe to whom it was moſt " likely to be believed that Chriſt would have wrote, viz. " thoſe who were moſt familiar with him, and ſo moſt worthy " of having ſuch a ſecret committed to them; hereupon " they preſently thought of Peter and Paul, becauſe, I ſup- " poſe, they had often ſeen theſe two pictured with Chriſt, " ſeeing the paſſion of Peter and Paul on the ſame day is fre- " quently and ſolemnly celebrated at Rome."

[a] See Auguſt. c. 9. lib. cit.

[b] I interpret this of a Chriſtian, becauſe he makes a plain oppoſition between theſe, and thoſe whom he calls *inimici nominis Chriſti, i. e.* Heathens.

If

If this conjecture be juſt, we ſee an inſtance of the pious frauds of the firſt Chriſtians in forging books, which I aſſigned as one reaſon of the great number of Apocryphal pieces, in the firſt part of this work, chap. iv.

Numb. XIII. Another BOOK under the NAME of Our SAVIOUR CHRIST.

OF this we have ſome account in another part of the laſt cited book of St. Auſtin[a]. His words are

Primo mihi diſcutiendum occurrit, quod nonnulli quærere ſolent, cur ipſius Chriſti nulla ſcripta proferamus? Ita enim volunt, & ipſum credi neſcio quid aliud ſcripſiſſe, quod diligunt, nihilque ſenſiſſe contra Deos ſuos, ſed eos potius magico ritu coluiſſe, & Diſcipulos ejus non ſolum fuiſſe mentitos de illo, dicendo illum Deum per quem omnia facta ſunt, cum (non)[b] aliud niſi quam homo fuerit, quamvis excellentiſſimæ ſapientiæ, verum etiam de Diis eorum non hoc docuiſſe quod ab illo didiciſſent.

I judged it neceſſary firſt to diſcuſs a queſtion moved by ſome [Pagans], *Why we* [Chriſtians] *can produce no books written by Chriſt himſelf?* For ſo they would perſuade us, that he wrote ſome other ſort of book (different from the Evangeliſts), which they eſteem, and in which he appears to have thought nothing to the prejudice of their Gods, but on the other hand himſelf to have worſhipped them with magical ceremonies, and that his Diſciples did not only aſſert falſe things of him, in ſaying, That he was the God by whom all things were made, when he was no more than a mere man, though of moſt extraordinary wiſdom, but that he did not teach thoſe things concerning their Gods which they (pretended to have) learnt.

[a] Cap. 34.

[b] I inſert the particle *non*, becauſe either that or ſome other word like it was certainly wrote by St. Auſtin, though it be not in my edition.

It

It would ſeem at firſt view, the book here mentioned was the ſame with the foregoing, each of them treating concerning the magick of Chriſt; but, if I miſtake not, there is a probable reaſon at leaſt to *conclude them to have been different*, becauſe St. Auſtin ſuppoſes the former to have been compoſed by ſome impious Chriſtian; but this he could not poſſibly conceive to have the ſame original. It is poſſible a Chriſtian ſo called (for there were many in thoſe days little more ſo than in name) might conceive a magical book, and publiſh it under the name of Chriſt, which is the caſe in reſpect of the former book; but it is impoſſible a perſon ſhould take upon him the Chriſtian name, and write a book to prove Chriſt a worſhipper of the idol Gods, to countenance the Heathens in their idolatry, and to make all his Apoſtles and Diſciples impoſtors and liars, which is the caſe with reſpect to the book now under conſideration. However this be, it was certainly Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, VI, and VIII.

After reading what has been ſaid concerning theſe two magical books aſcribed to Chriſt, I hope no one will be ſurpriſed at the mention of them; nor is it ſtrange, ſuch forged accounts ſhould be publiſhed, when we find that as the Jews objected to our Saviour himſelf, that he wrought his miracles by the power of devils, Matt. xii. 24. ſo both Jews and Gentiles endeavoured to ſpread the ſame malicious lies in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity. Celſus frequently makes this impious objection, *that Chriſt learned his magical arts from the Egyptians*, among whom he had his education[a]. The ſame we meet with frequently as made by others in the writings of Euſebius[b], Arnobius[c], Auſtin[d], &c. The Jews have a trite idle fable to the ſame purpoſe, *That in the reign of Queen Helena there was a ſtone in the temple of Jeruſalem, on which the ark was formerly placed, on which was engraved* שם המפורש *i. e. the name Jehovah, in ſuch letters that it might*

[a] Vid. Origen. contra Celſ. l. 1. p. 30. & l. 8. p. 384. & Spencer. Annot. in lib. 1. p. 7.

[b] Contr. Hieroc. & Demonſt. Evang. l. 3. §. 6.

[c] Contr. Gent. l. 1. p. 15.

[d] Loc. ſuprà cit. & Serm. xi. in Matth. p. 38. Tom. Opp. 10.

be

be read (for the Jews all hold that name ineffable, and not to be pronounced). *Now the efficacy of this name was ſuch, that whoever learned the pronunciation of it, became thereby able to work all ſorts of miracles. But the wiſe men among them, fearing leſt an ill uſe ſhould be made hereof, appointed brazen dogs to keep the gate, which were formed with ſuch exquiſite art, that if any ſhould learn the name, and be going away with it in his memory, they ſhould be ſo affrighted with the terrible barkings of the dogs, as to forget it; but that Jeſus knowing this, wrote it down in parchment, and ſewed it up in a wound which he made in his thigh for that purpoſe, and ſo, after he went out of the temple, taking forth the parchment, recovered the name again which he had forgot, and by virtue of it wrought all his miracles.*

Such were the deſpicable objections the Jews and Heathens made againſt our Saviour; the confutation of which in a very juſt and clear manner may be read in the fore-cited places of Origen, Euſebius, Auſtin, and eſpecially Arnobius; and among the moderns in the celebrated Huetius [a]; and Dr. Parker's Demonſtration of the Divine Authority of the Chriſtian Religion [b].

[a] Demonſtrat. Evang. Prop. IX. c. 39. [b] Sect. 25.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

A ſpurious Epiſtle of Chriſt among the Manichees. A notorious Blunder of Mr. Toland. A Hymn which Chriſt taught his Diſciples, forged by the Priſcillianiſts in the fourth Century. The Occaſion of the Forgery. The Spuriouſneſs of the Hymn.

Numb. XIV. The EPISTLE of CHRIST produced by the MANICHEES.

THE only account which we have of this Letter is in St. Auſtin's Diſputation with Fauſtus the Manichee[a].

Quis eſt ergo tam demens, qui hodiè credat eſſe Epiſtolam Chriſti, quam protulerit Manichæus, & non credat facta vel dicta eſſe Chriſti quæ ſcripſit Matthæus?

Can any one be ſo wild, as to believe that to be the Epiſtle of Chriſt, which Manichæus produces, and not believe the hiſtories and doctrines of Chriſt, which are related by Matthew?

Mr. Fabritius[b] ſuppoſes, that this paſſage does not fully prove, that the Manichees really had any ſuch Epiſtle under the name of Chriſt, but that St. Auſtin only, for argument's ſake, makes ſuch a ſuppoſition; but the whole ſeries of the Father's reaſoning ſeems to prove the contrary. He is endeavouring to prove the reaſonableneſs of the Manichees ſubmitting to the authority of St. Matthew's Goſpel; and his argument ſtands fairly thus: "You boaſt of an Epiſtle, which "you have, written by Chriſt: this, if it were really ſo, "muſt needs have been read and received with the utmoſt "veneration in the Church, that has a continued ſucceſſion "of Biſhops from the Apoſtles' time: but it has no ſuch evi- "dence of its being genuine, and yet you believe it rather "than Matthew's Goſpel, which was always received by the

[a] Contr. Fauſt. Manich. lib. 28. c. 4. T. Opp. 6.

[b] Cod. Apoc. N. T. Pars 1. p. 306. in Notis.

" Church. Beſides, your pretended Epiſtle receives all its " credit from an obſcure man of Perſia, who lived two hun- " dred years or more after Chriſt; and is he likely to give a " better account of what Chriſt ſaid and did than Matthew, " who was one of his Apoſtles and companions?"

Thus far he; which reaſoning neceſſarily ſuppoſes a real Epiſtle under Chriſt's name, among the Manichees: what doctrines it contained, I cannot gueſs, any farther, than that it is probable they were ſuch as peculiarly ſuited to the opinions of Manes and his followers, of which a ſpecimen is given above, Chap. V. It was certainly a ſpurious piece, as appears by St. Auſtin's reaſoning and Prop. IV, V, VI.

I ſcarce know whether it be worth while to trouble the reader with the following remark on Mr. Toland's inaccuracy in quotations, unleſs it may be looked upon as (which I think I may juſtly ſay it is) a ſpecimen of his conſtant foul dealing in theſe matters. In his catalogue of books reported to be written by Chriſt (Amynt. p. 21.) he refers his reader to this book of St. Auſtin for *an Epiſtle of Chriſt to Peter and Paul*; and quotes lib. 28. c. 13. Now in all this book there is not one ſyllable of any ſuch Epiſtle; and whereas he cites the thirteenth chapter, there are but five chapters in that book: but this is not all; he produces another book, which he calls, *A Book of the Magick of Chriſt*, and for this refers the reader to Auguſt. de Conſenſ. Evang. lib. 1. cap. 9, 10. and then adds, *If it be not the ſame with the Epiſtle to Peter and Paul*, i. e. the Epiſtle which he thought had been mentioned in the twenty-eighth book againſt Fauſtus: a learned note indeed! In the firſt place to gueſs this the ſame with a book which was not mentioned in the place cited, and then to gueſs it to be the very ſame with itſelf; for had this blunderer but caſt his eye upon the place he refers to in St. Auſtin de Conſenſ. he muſt have ſeen that the book of the Magick of Chriſt was in that very place ſaid to be wrote in form of an Epiſtle to Peter and Paul. But it is plain he cited from others, and was glad to ſay any thing which would ſound bad againſt Chriſtianity, though ſo plainly at the expence of his ingenuity and integrity.

Numb.

Numb. XV. A HYMN which CHRIST taught his DISCIPLES.

MR. TOLAND in his fore-mentioned catalogue, and Mr. Fabritius[a] have obſerved this ſpurious piece in an Epiſtle under St. Auſtin's name, inſcribed to a Biſhop called Ceretius. But as this Epiſtle is not in my edition of that Father's works, I am obliged entirely to depend on Mr. Fabritius's quotation out of him, which, that nothing may be wanting here, I ſhall tranſcribe with the addition of a few remarks.

Hymnus ſanè quem dicunt Priſcillianiſtæ eſſe Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, qui maximè permovit venerationem tuam, in Scripturis ſolet Apocryphis inveniri.——Priſcillianiſtæ vero accipiunt omnia & Canonica & Apocrypha ſimul.—Habes verba illorum in illo codice poſita, *Hymnus Domini quem dixit ſecretè ſanctis Apoſtolis & Diſcipulis, quia ſcriptum eſt in Evangelio,* Hymno dicto aſcendit in montem, *& qui in Canone non eſt poſitus propter eos qui ſecundum ſe ſentiunt, & non ſecundum Spiritum & veritatem Dei.*— In iſto Hymno cantatur & dicitur, *Solvere volo & ſolvi volo—Salvare volo & ſalvari volo—Ornare volo & ornari volo—Lucerna ſum tibi, ille*

As for that hymn which the Priſcillianiſts ſay is our Lord Jeſus Chriſt's, and for which you have ſo great a veneration, it is really among the Apocryphal Scriptures. The Priſcillianiſts receive all ſorts of books, Canonical and Apocryphal too. You have their words in that Book, A HYMN WHICH CHRIST SECRETLY TAUGHT HIS APOSTLES AND DISCIPLES; for it is written, *Having ſung a hymn, he went up into a mountain,* and which is not placed in the Canon by reaſon of thoſe who are governed by their own ſentiments, and not by the Spirit and truth of God. In that hymn there are the following words to be ſung and ſaid, *I will bind, and*

[a] Lib. ſup. cit. p. 307.

qui me vides—Janua ſum tibi, quicunque me pulſas——Qui vides quod ago, tace opera mea.

I will be bound. I will ſave, and I will be ſaved. I will adorn, and I will be adorned. I am a light to thee, who ſeeſt me. I am a gate to thee, who knockeſt at me. Thou who ſeeſt what I do, conceal my works.

From this account we ſee what gave occaſion to this impious forgery, viz. *our Saviour's ſinging a hymn with his Apoſtles after the paſchal ſupper, and their going thereupon up to the mount of Olives*, Matt. xxvi. 30. The hereticks, who eſteemed it, were an impious ſort of Chriſtians, in the middle of the fourth century, ſo called from Priſcillianus, a Spaniard [a], who jumbled together and adopted the ſilly and ridiculous tenets of the Gnoſticks and Montaniſts. That this hymn was forged by Priſcillian himſelf, or ſome of his followers, ſeems to me probable, from the laſt words of it in the foregoing fragment, *Thou, who ſeeſt what I do, conceal my works.* For concealing their myſteries and ſecrecy of their doctrines was enjoined all the ſect; and St. Auſtin tells us, this was one of their maxims [b];

Jura; perjura; ſecretum prodere noli.
Swear; forſwear; but be careful of your ſecrets.

However it may be, as to this conjecture, the hymn was certainly ſpurious, for the ſame reaſons as the former pieces falſely aſcribed to Chriſt, Prop. IV, V, and VI. But beſides, the ſhort fragment given us by St. Auſtin undeniably proves it; for there cannot be any thing more diſagreeable to the ſtyle of Chriſt than it is; in which there are no where ſuch jingles and playing with ſounds, as appear to be in this. Moreover, if I miſtake not, the jingle in the two firſt ſentences proves this hymn to be firſt written in the Latin tongue; for though indeed it is poſſible they may be a tranſlation, yet nothing can be more improbable, than that two

[a] Vid. Auguſt. de Hæreſ. Num. 70. T. Opp. 6.

[b] De Hæreſ. ad Quodv. Num. 70. T. Opp. 6.

ſuch

ſuch diſtinct ideas, as *binding* and *ſaving*, ſhould have been brought together in ſuch a manner, as they are, by any other means, than the great likeneſs which there is between the ſounds, *ſolvere* and *ſalvare*. Nothing elſe could have produced two ſuch ſentences as, *ſolvere volo & ſolvi volo, ſalvare volo & ſalvari volo*. It is therefore to be judged ſpurious by Prop. XI. and XII.

But to conclude this matter, it is plain by the expreſs teſtimonies of the beſt writers among the antients, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt left nothing behind him in writing, although there be indeed many ſayings, not in our Goſpels, attributed to our Saviour, to be found in the antient books, which, for the entertainment of the curious in theſe things, I have collected, and ſhall place in an Appendix at the end of this volume.

CHAP. XVI.

The Teſtimonies of the Antients concerning the Goſpel of the Egyptians. All its Fragments: ſuppoſed by later Writers to be written before Luke wrote his Goſpel. Too highly eſteemed by the Moderns. Rejected by all the Antients as Apocryphal. Clemens Alexandrinus rejected it. It was forged by the Monks of Egypt. This largely proved, with an Account of Philo's Therapeutæ.

Numb. XVI. The GOSPEL according to the EGYPTIANS.

THIS was one of the moſt celebrated of all the antient Apocryphal books; it is frequently mentioned in the old writings, and very highly eſteemed by ſeveral of our modern criticks, being ſuppoſed to have been *a faithful compoſure of ſome catholick Chriſtians in Egypt, before either of the four Canonical Goſpels now received.* It requires therefore a very exact and critical enquiry; in attempting which I ſhall, accord-

ing to my method, firſt produce the teſtimonies and fragments of it, which are to be found in the antient books, then the opinions of the moderns, which I have met with, concerning it, adding the moſt ſuitable remarks I can upon the whole.

The antient Teſtimonies and Fragments of the Goſpel according to the Egyptians.

I. THE firſt writer who has mentioned any thing of it, is Clemens Alexandrinus in the latter end of the ſecond century: the ſeveral places are as follow, viz.

Strom. lib. 3. p. 445.

Τῇ Σαλώμῃ ὁ Κύριος συνθανομένῃ, μέχρι πότε θάνατος ἰσχύσει· ἔφη, ὡς κακοῦ τοῦ βίου ὄντος, καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πονηρᾶς· Μέχρις ἂν, εἶπεν, ὑμεῖς αἱ γυναῖκες τίκτετε.

When Salome aſked our Lord, *How long Death ſhould prevail?* (not as though life were an evil, or the creation an evil) he anſwered, *As long as ye women do bring forth children.*

It is not expreſsly ſaid by Clemens here, that this paſſage was in the Goſpel of the Egyptians; but it evidently appears to be taken thence by the next paſſage a few pages after, viz.

Page 452.

Οἱ δὲ ἀντιτασσόμενοι, τῇ κτίσει τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς εὐφήμου ἐγκρατείας, κἀκεῖνα λέγουσι τὰ πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένα, ὧν προτέρου ἐμνήσθημεν. Φέρεται δέ, οἶμαι, ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους Εὐαγγελίῳ· φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν Σωτήρ, Ἦλθον καταλύσαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας· θηλείας μὲν,

But they who oppoſe (the deſign) of God's creation, by their ſpecious pretences to celibacy, cite thoſe things which our Saviour ſpake to Salome, which I juſt before mentioned. They are, I think, in *the Goſpel according to the Egyptians*; for they ſay, that our Saviour himſelf ſaid, *I am come to deſtroy the works of the woman,*

τῆς

τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ἔργα, δὲ γένεσιν καὶ φθοράν.

that is, the works of female concupiſcence, generation and corruption.

From what follows in Clemens it appears, that upon our Saviour's ſaying this, Salome aſked him the foregoing queſtion, viz. *How long it ſhould be that death ſhould prevail againſt men?* and he anſwered, *While ye women bring forth children.* To which in the next page we meet with her reply, and our Saviour's anſwer again,

Page 453.

Φαμέινης γὰρ αὐτῆς, Καλῶς ἂν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα, ὡς δ δέοντος τῆς γενέσεως παραλαμβανομένης· ἀμείβεται λέγων ὁ Κύριος, Πᾶσαν φάγε βοτάνην, τὴν δὲ πικρίαν ἔχουσαν μὴ φάγης.

Hereupon ſhe ſaid, *Then I have done well in bearing no children, ſeeing there is no neceſſity of generation.* To which our Lord replied, *Feed upon every herb, but that which is bitter eat not.*

Page 465.

Διὰ τοῦτό τοι ὁ Κασσιανὸς φησὶ, συνθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης, πότε γνωσθήσεται τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο, ἔφη ὁ Κύριος, Ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε, καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρρεν, οὔτε θῆλυ· πρῶτον μὲν ἓν, ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέταρσιν Εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους.

Wherefore Caſſianus ſaith, that when Salome aſked (Chriſt) *When the things ſhould be known, concerning which ſhe enquired?* our Lord anſwered, *When you ſhall deſpiſe*, or have no need for, *a covering of your nakedneſs, and when two ſhall become one, and the male with the female, neither male nor female.* (Clemens adds) Firſt, I obſerve, this is not in either of the four Goſpels delivered to us, but *in the Goſpel according to the Egyptians.*

This laſt paſſage, with ſome little variation, is in the end of *the ſecond Epiſtle of Clemens to the Corinthians*, and will be produced in the Appendix at the end of this volume.

II. *The Goſpel according to the Egyptians* is mentioned by Origen [a], *The Church receives only four Goſpels; the hereticks have very many, ſuch as that according to the Egyptians, &c.* See the paſſage produced at large above, Num. V. chap. 7. It is mentioned in the ſame manner by Ambroſe: ſee the ſame place.

III. It is alſo mentioned by Jerome [b] in the paſſage above produced at large, Num. IV. chap. 7. in init. *Many have wrote Goſpels, which gave occaſion to hereſies, without the Spirit and Grace of God, ſuch as that according to the Egyptians, &c.*

IV. Epiphanius in his account of the hereſy of the Sabellians ſaith, they eſtabliſhed their erroneous principles by *the Goſpel of the Egyptians*, and other Apocryphal books. His words are,

Hæreſ. LXII. §. 2.

Κέχρηνται δὲ ταῖς πάσαις γραφαῖς παλαιᾶς τε καὶ καινῆς Διαθήκης, λέξεσι δέ τισιν αἷς αὐτοὶ ἐκλέγονται κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν παραπεποιημένην φρενοβλάβειάν τε καὶ ἄνοιαν—Τὴν δὲ πᾶσαν αὐτῶν πλανὴν, καὶ τὴν τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν δύναμιν ἔχουσιν ἐξ Ἀποκρύφων τινῶν, μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ καλουμένου Αἰγυπτίου Εὐαγγελίου, ᾧ τινες τὸ ὄνομα ἐπέθεντο τοῦτο· ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ πολ-

They make uſe of all the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Teſtament, but principally of ſome certain paſſages, which they pick out according to their own corrupt and prepoſterous ſentiments.—But the whole of their errors, and the main ſtrength of their heterodoxy they have from ſome Apocryphal books, but principally from that which is called, *The Goſpel of the Egyptians*; which is a name ſome have given it:

[a] Homil. in Luc. i. 1.

[b] Præf. in Comm. in Matth.

λὰ

λὰ τοιαῦτα ὡς ἐν παραβύσῳ μυστηριωδῶς, ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναφέρεται, ὡς αὐτὸς δηλοῦντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

for in that many things of this sort are proposed in a hidden mysterious manner, as by our Saviour, as though he had said to his Disciples, *That the Father was the same* Person, *the Son the same* Person, *and the Holy Ghost the same* Person.

These are the accounts we have from antiquity of this famous Gospel.

My second proposal was, in like manner to give some account of the sentiments of more modern writers concerning it.

Sixtus Senensis [a].

The Gospel of the Egyptians, or *according to the Egyptians*, was made use of by the hereticks, called Valentinians. Clemens Alexandrinus rejects (answers) certain testimonies cited out of it by Julius Cassianus, and other hereticks, to confirm their errors. Epiphanius says, the Sabellians endeavoured to prove out of it, that the Father, Son and Spirit were one Person.

Erasmus [b].

When St. Luke says, chap. i. ver. 1. That *many have taken in hand to write, &c.* he means those who attempted, but were not successful in writing; for at that time not only the Gospels of St. Matthew and Mark were extant, but many other Gospels were published, viz. The Gospel of the Nazarenes, Thomas, Matthias, the Gospel according to the Egyptians, that of the Twelve Apostles, Nicodemus, and others, which were afterwards rejected by the Church as Apocryphal.

Grotius [c].

It is evident, that, when St. Luke wrote his Gospel, there were many other books extant concerning Christ, the importance

[a] Biblioth. Sanct. l b. 2. p. 38.
[b] Annot. in Luc. c. 1. v. 1.
[c] Annot. in eund. loc.

of

of the ſubject influencing many to that undertaking: but as theſe others collected the common rumours, it is not ſtrange they ſhould mix true and falſe things together, among whom I reckon the moſt antient writer of the Goſpel according to the Egyptians: for as to the other Goſpels which were ſpread abroad, they are the impious forgeries of much later days.

Mr. Du Pin [a].

The antients make mention of two Goſpels, which were not of the ſame authority with the four Canonical Goſpels, but which cannot be rejected, as records invented by the hereticks to authoriſe their errors, viz. *the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, and *the Goſpel according to the Egyptians*.

Father Simon [b].

The Fathers have ſometimes made uſe of Apocryphal books, and have quoted even falſe Goſpels; as for example, the Goſpel that is called, *according to the Egyptians*; which yet is not on this ſcore alone to be reckoned authentick, viz. becauſe it is thought to be moſt antient, and cited in Clemens Alexandrinus; nor ought we to reject it under this pretence alone, that the Gnoſticks and Sabellians have maintained their errors by this book.

Dr. Grabe [c].

What this learned writer ſaith concerning this Goſpel is too long to be here tranſcribed; it may be ſufficient to expreſs the ſubſtance of his opinion in the following particulars. He ſuppoſes,

1. *It had its title from its firſt authors*, whom the myſtical ſtyle of the book, ſo much in requeſt among the Egyptians, evidences to have been ſome Chriſtians in Egypt.

2. That this, as well as *the Goſpel of the Hebrews*, was *publiſhed before Luke's Goſpel, and was referred to by him in his Preface*, as being wrote before either of the four Canonical Goſpels.

[a] Hiſt. of the Canon of the New Teſt. Vol. 2. c. 6. §. 3.

[b] Critic. Hiſt. of the New Teſt. part 1. c. 3. p. 28.

[c] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 31 to p. 34.

3. *That*

3. *That Clemens Alexandrinus did not reject it*, but endeavoured rather to explain it, and make the paſſages cited of it to appear capable of a good meaning, which he would never have done, if he eſteemed it the compoſure of an heretick.

Dr. Mills.

About this time, viz. the year of Chriſt 58, or a little ſooner, there were compoſed by the believing Chriſtians certain hiſtorical accounts of Chriſt and his actions, as appears from St. Luke's Preface to his Goſpel. Theſe were compoſed before either of our preſent Canonical Goſpels, not with any ill deſign, but the very ſame as our Goſpels now received. Among theſe the moſt celebrated were, the *Goſpel of the Hebrews*, and *the Goſpel according to the Egyptians*; ſee his Prolegom. in N. T. §. 35 to 38. It is probable the authors of it were Eſſenes, who received the Chriſtian faith from the preaching of Mark at Alexandria. Nor does it ſeem to have been made uſe of by them publickly, after the publiſhing of our four Canonical Goſpels. See §. 50.

Mr. Le Clerc [a].

Several learned men ſuppoſe the falſe Goſpels, viz. that *according to the Hebrews*, or that *according to the Egyptians*, gave occaſion to Mark and Luke to write their Goſpels; but inaſmuch as we find no intimations of this in our Goſpels, it ſeems much better to believe, that thoſe holy and inſpired men were ſufficiently appriſed of the danger of leaving ſuch important matters only to the memories of men, before any ſuch ſpurious Goſpels were publiſhed.

Mr. Whiſton [b].

The Therapeutæ mentioned by Philo ſeem to have been thoſe firſt Chriſtians *Aſceticks*, which were converted from the Jews, chiefly in Egypt, ſoon after our Saviour's paſſion, before the coming of Mark thither, and to have both imperfectly underſtood and practiſed the Chriſtian religion. Euſe-

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. Secul. I. Ann. LXV. §. 11. p. 430.

[b] Eſſay on the Conſtitut. c. 1. p. 37.

bius,

bius, Epiphanius and Jerome, plainly take them for Chriſtians, and their ſacred antient myſtical books are by Euſebius ſuppoſed to be the *Goſpels and Epiſtles of the New Teſtament*[a]. The modern criticks are entirely puzzled about theſe Therapeutæ, and yet are not willing commonly to believe them Chriſtians. And indeed Euſebius's opinion, that their antient allegorical books were our Goſpels and Epiſtles, is liable to great exceptions, ſince they are not allegorical in their nature, nor were they publiſhed any conſiderable time before Philo's own writings; ſo that upon the whole, I believe, it is more reaſonable to ſay, theſe Therapeutæ were thoſe firſt Chriſtians *Aſcetick*s, who had gotten very imperfect accounts of Chriſtianity, and were guided by *the Goſpel according to the Egyptians*, which, we know by the fragments remaining, was a Goſpel ſufficiently myſtical and allegorical, according to the genius of that nation.

Theſe are the ſentiments of the criticks in later ages concerning this Goſpel. I have now only left to make ſome reflections upon the whole. Accordingly I obſerve:

OBSERV. I. That *the Goſpel of the Egyptians* was certainly an Apocryphal book. This appears, 1. by Prop. IV. *it not being found in any of the antient catalogues of ſacred writings*; 2. by Prop. V. *as it is not cited in any of the old records of Chriſtianity*, but rejected as Apocryphal by Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Jerome and Epiphanius, who are the only Fathers who have mentioned the name of it. This is evident as to the three laſt, and may be eaſily collected from the paſſages of Clemens above cited, as I ſhall undeniably ſhew preſently; 3. by Prop. VI. *it not appearing even to have been read in the Chriſtian aſſemblies*; 4. by Prop. VIII. *as it contained things contrary to known truths*. Of this ſort I believe every one will readily allow *the doctrine of the unlawfulneſs of all marriages*, which, it is certain from the paſſages of Clemens, this Goſpel aſſerted. Of this ſort muſt needs be *our Saviour's declaring, he came into the world to put an end to all*

[a] Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 2. c. 17. p. 53, &c.

marriage,

marriage, *i. e.* in effect to the race of mankind; which it is plain, by the whole of Clemens's arguing, as well as by the paſſage itſelf, was declared as ſpoken by Chriſt in this Goſpel. Laſtly, of this ſort Epiphanius reckoned the Sabellian hereſy, which was evidently contained therein; but from hence I conclude nothing, it being at this day defended by ſome: but a moſt undoubted inſtance of falſehood is, that Salome in this Goſpel is introduced, as applauding herſelf *for having borne no children* (ſee the place above out of Clem. Alexand. p. 453.) whereas it is certain, that Salome was the wife of Zebedee, and the mother of James and John, two of our Lord's Apoſtles; for ſhe, who is by Matthew called *the mother of Zebedee's children*, chap. xxvii. 56. is by Mark, chap. xv. 40. expreſsly called Salome: that theſe children were John and James, appears from Matt. iv. 21. x. 2. and many other places. 5. It was evidently Apocryphal by Prop. XI. ſeeing it *relates thoſe things as ſpoken by Chriſt, which are directly oppoſite to his known ſtyle and manner of ſpeaking*; for whereas that was *perfectly clear, eaſy and familiar*, the ſayings here attributed to him are each of them *myſtical, involved and perplexed*, and more like the fooliſh ambiguous anſwers of the *Delphick oracles*, than the rational and plain diſcourſes of Jeſus Chriſt. To inſtance only in one, when Salome aſked him, *When the things, which ſhe enquired about, ſhould come to paſs?* He is made to anſwer, *When you ſhall tread under foot* (or deſpiſe) *the covering of your nakedneſs, and when two ſhall become one, and the male with the female neither male nor female.*

It ſeems therefore very unaccountable, that the authors above mentioned, viz. Grotius, Du Pin, Father Simon, and Dr. Grabe, *ſhould have thought ſo highly of this Goſpel*, and reckon it of a different ſort from the books of hereticks, *and not to be rejected.* I leave it to the reader, after what is now ſaid, to judge, whether the five arguments I have offered to prove it Apocryphal, do not alſo evidence it to have been the compoſure of ſome monſtrous and ſilly hereticks, as Origen and Jerome expreſsly ſay, and conſequently to be rejected as an impious and ridiculous forgery.

OBSERV.

OBSERV. II. *Clemens Alexandrinus never saw the Gospel of the Egyptians, never made one citation out of it, but, on the contrary, rejected it as an impious, heretical, and Apocryphal book.*

This observation is of very considerable importance in this matter, because the want of it induced the learned criticks just named into their erroneous and too high opinion of this Gospel. They imagined, it was appealed to, and made use of, by Clemens Romanus and Clemens Alexandrinus in their writings, and therefore concluded, it ought not to be meanly thought of. *It is cited by St. Clemens of Alexandria* (saith Du Pin [a]), Clemens Romanus (saith Dr. Grabe [b]), or *whoever was the author of the second Epistle to the Corinthians, undoubtedly most antient, made use of it.* And again, *Clemens Alexandrinus doth not reject it, but so far approve of it, as to endeavour to explain its mystical and obscure passages.* But as I shall hereafter prove abundantly, that Clemens of Rome never made any appeal to this Apocryphal Gospel, (viz. in the Appendix) so I shall endeavour here to prove the same of Clemens of Alexandria. My observation consists of three parts: viz. that he *never saw it, nor cited it, but rejected it.* I shall endeavour to prove the truth of each separately.

1. *Clemens Alexandrinus never saw the Gospel according to the Egyptians.* This I gather from what himself says in the second testimony, viz. p. 452. above produced; Φέρεται δὲ, οἶμαι, ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους Εὐαγγελίῳ, φασὶ γὰρ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν Σωτὴρ, &c. *These things* (viz. the discourses between Christ and Salome) *are,* AS I SUPPOSE, *to be found in the Gospel according to the Egyptians; for,* they say, *that our Saviour said, &c.* From whence it is plain, that he was uncertain in what Gospel these discourses were, else he would not have said, *I suppose* they are therein. Had he read the Gospel, or ever seen it, he could not have been in this doubting uncertainty. Besides, from the next words it is evident, he only cites by tradition from others, *they say, that our Saviour said these things*; which implies his own dubiousness and ignorance in the matter.

[a] Histor. of the Canon of the N. Test. vol. 2. c. 6. §. 3.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 34.

2. Clemens

2. Clemens Alexandrinus *never cited or appealed to this Goſpel.* This indeed does neceſſarily follow from the former head, but will more clearly appear, if we conſider, that all the ſeveral fragments of it, that are extant in Clemens, *were produced by the hereticks, againſt whom he is diſputing, not by him,* as will appear by a bare reading the places cited: ſo the firſt paſſage, page 445, he premiſes ἔπειτα καὶ διατρεπέον, αὐτοὺς τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν φερόμενα διαλύοντας, ὥδέ πως, τῇ Σαλώμῃ ὁ Κύριος, &c. *Now I muſt overthrow and confute the things urged or cited by them out of the Goſpel of the Egyptians, &c.* So likewiſe in the next paſſage, p. 452. Οἱ δὲ ἀντιτασσόμενοι τῇ κλίσει τῇ Θεοῦ—κακείνα λέγουσι τὰ πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένα, ὧν πρότερον ἐμνήσθημεν, &c. *They who oppoſe the deſigns of God's creation by their ſpecious pretences to celibacy,* cite thoſe things, *which our Saviour ſpake to Salome, which I have above mentioned, &c.* Again in the third paſſage, p. 453. He premiſes, οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς τῶν πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένων ἐπιφέρουσιν, &c. *The things which follow, ſpoken to Salome,* they cite, *who had rather uſe any books than the Canonical ones, &c.* Once more p. 465. he particularly mentions the perſon who cited this Goſpel, Διὰ τοῦτό τοι ὁ Κασσιανὸς φησὶ, πυνθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης, &c. *Wherefore Caſſianus ſaith, when Salome aſked Chriſt, &c.* So that nothing can be more manifeſt, than that Clemens himſelf does not cite or appeal to this Apocryphal piece, but only cites the writings of hereticks, in which appeals were made to it.

But, 3. Clemens was ſo far from citing it, or approving *the Goſpel of the Egyptians, that he utterly rejects it, as an impious, heretical, and Apocryphal book.* This will be manifeſt, if we obſerve, that the only deſign of Clemens, in producing theſe paſſages out of the hereticks' books, is to confute them, and their ridiculous notions of the unlawfulneſs of all ſorts of marriages. Hence he begins with this introduction, p. 445. "As for thoſe who by ſpecious pretences of continency think "impiouſly both of the creation, and the Holy Creator, the "only Almighty God, and ſay, that no marriages are lawful, "nor procreation of children; that we ought not to bring "others into the world to be unhappy, nor ſatisfy the cruelty "of death, I have the following things to ſay; firſt, that of

"John

" John, *And now, there are many Antichriſts, whence we know* " *the later times are come. They went out from us, but were* " *never of us, for if they had been of us, then they would have* " *continued with us.* Ἔπειτα καὶ διαῤῥηθέον αὐτὰς, τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν " φερόμενα διαλυόντας, ὧδέ πως, τῇ Σαλώμῃ, &c. *In the next place* " *I muſt confute thoſe things, which they cite* (out of the Goſ- " pel of the Egyptians) *in this manner, When Salome aſked* " *Chriſt, &c. p.* 445." Which when he had confuted, he introduces the next paſſage thus: " *They who by their plauſible* " *celibacy oppoſe the creation of God, urge the things ſpoken by* " *Chriſt to Salome, &c. p.* 452." And in the next page, though he does not call this Goſpel in ſo many words Apocryphal, yet he plainly does in other words: Οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς τῶν πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένων, ἐπιφέρουσιν, οἱ πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν εὐαγγελικῷ γοιχήσαντες Κανόνι, φαμένης γὰρ αὐτῆς, &c. *The things which follow, ſpoken to Salome, they cite, who had rather follow any thing than the true Canon of the Goſpel, &c. p.* 453. Once more, when he is about to anſwer the fragment urged out of this Goſpel, he reaſons againſt it thus: Πρῶτον μὲν ἓν, ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέταρσιν Εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους. *Firſt*, ſays he, *this ſaying is not in either of the four Goſpel which have been* (received) *delivered to us, but in that according to the Egyptians*, p. 465. He who will lay theſe things together without prejudice, muſt evidently perceive, that as Clemens never ſaw, ſo he utterly rejected the authority of this Goſpel, and eſteemed it no other than a vile forgery of ſome impious hereticks. I wiſh Dr. Grabe had well conſidered theſe things, before he gave this Goſpel ſo high a character; but prejudice ſtrangely blinds the greateſt men; and it is eaſy to ſee that Dr. Grabe's circumſtances, when in England, inclined him to a too fond affection for Apocryphal books: ſo that I think Le Clerc did him no injuſtice, when he lately ſtyled him *Apocryphorum nimis ſtudioſus*[a].

[a] Hiſtor. Eccl. de Aſcenſ. Chriſt. ad Ann. 29. not. ad. §. 13. p. 333.

OBSERV.

OBSERV. III. *The Goſpel of the Egyptians ſeems to have been compoſed by ſome very early hereticks to ſupport their doctrines of celibacy and abſtemiouſneſs, and very probably by thoſe of Egypt.*

To confirm this conjecture, I obſerve,

Firſt, *That there were in the very infancy of Chriſtianity great numbers of perſons called Chriſtians, who aſſerted the unlawfulneſs of marriages, and profeſſed a great abſtemiouſneſs in their manner of life.* Againſt theſe St. Paul writes in ſeveral of his Epiſtles; for inſtance, thoſe words, 1 Cor. vii. 1. *It is good for a man not to touch a woman*; which are not St. Paul's words, (as our Tranſlation makes them to be, and moſt perſons think) but *their words to him*, intimating a queſtion that had been ſtarted by ſome hereticks among them, *whether it was lawful to marry?* In his firſt Epiſtle to Timothy, (c. iv. 3.) he more plainly mentions them as *departers from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and doctrines of Devils—forbidding to marry, and commanding to abſtain from meats, &c.* And again, in his Epiſtle to the Coloſſians, (c. ii. 21.) he blames them *for being influenced by the doctrines which commanded them to* touch not, taſte not, and handle not, i. e. *not touch women, but abſtain from marriages, and certain ſort of meats.* In theſe places the Apoſtle is guarding his converts againſt the artful inſinuations of thoſe who declared it was unlawful for a man to marry, or have any concern with a woman; and thus thoſe, who lived near the Apoſtle's time, and while theſe fooliſh tenets were yet in eſteem, underſtood him. So Clemens Alexandrinus in the forecited book [a] interprets both thoſe laſt paſſages of Paul, *concerning thoſe who abhorred matrimony*, περὶ τῶν βδελυσσομένων γάμον ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος λέγει; and Tertullian expounds the paſſage in Tim. iv. 3. [b] *The Apoſtle*, ſays he, *writes againſt them who forbad marriage, &c.* But beſides the Apoſtle's mentioning this, we find it in the writings of the firſt Fathers continually ſo; in the Epiſtle under the name of *Ignatius to the Philadelphians*, we read, *if any one call lawful marriage and the begetting of children corruption and pollution, or think any ſort of food abominable, ſuch perſon*

[a] P. 447. See alſo p. 462. [b] De Monogam. c. 15.

has the apoſtate dragon dwelling within him[a]. Though it is obſervable, that in another part of that ſame Epiſtle[b], the author *gives no ſmall encomium to the virgins in the Church of Philadelphia*, who were like Elijah, Joſhua, Melchiſedeck, Eliſha, Jeremiah, John Baptiſt, Timothy, Titus, Euodius, and Clement, who lived all their days in celibacy.

Irenæus, in his account of the hereſy and followers of Saturninus, tells us, it was their opinion, *that marrying and begetting children was from the Devil, that they abſtained from living creatures, and by their pretended ſanctity and abſtemiouſneſs induced many to follow them*[c]. The ſame he aſſerts was the doctrine of the Encratites[d], who ſprang from Marcion, and Saturninus of Tatian, and his followers[e]. Tertullian affirms the ſame of Marcion often[f]. Clemens Alexandrinus has wrote a whole book againſt this doctrine of the Marcionites and Gnoſticks, viz. that, in which *the Goſpel of the Egyptians* is mentioned. In ſhort, we find this doctrine profeſſed not only by the forementioned, but the Manichees[g], Apoſtolicks or Apotacticks[h], Origenians[i], and moſt of the hereticks of thoſe primitive times of the Church. I will only add, that in the ſpurious book, called *The Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles*, there is alſo frequent mention of this doctrine[k]; all which laid together will ſufficiently confirm the truth of my obſervation, that *there were in the infancy of Chriſtianity many perſons called Chriſtians, who denied the lawfulneſs of marriage.*

Secondly, *Theſe heretical opinions prevailed in a very remarkable degree in Egypt.* This I gather,

1. *From the common opinion of the antients*, that the Therapeutæ or Eſſenes (for it cannot be reaſonably doubted but they were the ſame perſons), of whom and their opinions Philo has wrote a whole book, *were no other than ſome imperfect Chriſtians.* Euſebius has largely attempted the proof of

[a] P. 102.
[b] P. 97, 98.
[c] Adv. Hæreſ. lib. 1. c. 22.
[d] Ibid. c. 30.
[e] Ibid. c. 31.
[f] Lib. 1. adv. Marcion. c. 29. & lib. 5. adv. eund. c. 7.
[g] Epiph. Hæreſ. 66.
[h] Id. Hæreſ. 61.
[i] Ibid. 64.
[k] See lib. 6. c. 8, 10, 26.

this,

this, and that by no contemptible arguments[a]. He firſt poſitively aſſerts, that after St. Mark had preached up and down in Egypt, and even planted Churches in the city of Alexandria, *there were immediately a great number of converts, who entered upon a rigid abſtemious life.* This I take as a fact moſt certain, becauſe it is by him ſo poſitively aſſerted, and not a conjecture drawn from Philo, who never mentions any thing of St. Mark. After this he produces a great part of Philo's book concerning the Eſſenes in Egypt, and their various ſentiments, endeavouring to ſhew, they were no other than Chriſtians, and that their antient ſacred books were the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, the Goſpels and Epiſtles of the New Teſtament. Jerome had the ſame opinion of Philo's book: he ſays in the Life of Mark[b], *that he went with his Goſpel, which he had wrote, into Egypt, and that he firſt preached Chriſt there, and conſtituted a Church; that he was ſo remarkable in the abſtemiouſneſs of his life, that he obliged all his converts to follow his example; inſomuch that Philo, the moſt eloquent of all the Jewiſh writers, when he ſaw the firſt (Chriſtian) Church at Alexandria ſtill obſerving the Jewiſh cuſtoms, thought it would be to the honour of his nation, (viz. the Jews) to write a book concerning their way of life; and as Luke ſays, the Chriſtians at Jeruſalem had all things common, ſo he relates that it was at Alexandria under Mark's inſtructions.* And to the ſame purpoſe a little after, in his Life of Philo, Jerome ſaith, that he placed Philo among the Church writers, *becauſe, by writing a book concerning the firſt Church of Mark at Alexandria, he has ſaid much in commendation of the Chriſtians: he not only mentions ſuch as being there, but in many other provinces, and calls their places of abode monaſteries; from whence it appears, that the firſt Chriſtians, who believed there on Chriſt, were ſuch as the monks now pretend and deſire to be, viz. to have all things common, &c.*[c]

Epiphanius alſo followed Euſebius in his opinion[d], and makes Philo's Eſſenes at Alexandria not only to be Mark's

[a] Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 2. c. 16, 17.
[b] Catal. Viror. Illuſtr. in Marco.
[c] Ibid. in Philone.
[d] Hæreſ. 29. §. 4.

converts to Chriſtianity, *but to have derived their very name Eſſenes from their being Chriſtians. They who believed on Chriſt*, ſays he, *were called Jeſſæi (or Eſſenes) before they were called Chriſtians, either becauſe Jeſſe was the father of David, or from Jeſus, the name of our Lord, becauſe they were his Diſciples, and derived their conſtitution from him, or from the ſignification of the name Jeſus, which in Hebrew ſignifies the ſame as* Θεραπευτὴς (the name by which Philo calls them), i. e. *a Saviour, or Phyſician.* Whether theſe etymologies are right, I need not diſpute: Fuller, Serarius and Scaliger, have diſputed it ſufficiently [a]. The fact I contend for is ſufficiently plain, that Epiphanius thought theſe Eſſenes at Alexandria to have been the firſt Chriſtians there. I might here farther add the judgment of other antient writers to the ſame purpoſe, as Cedrenus, Sozomen, Nicephorus, &c. but it is needleſs in ſo evident a caſe. It has indeed been very much debated, whether their opinion in this matter be right, or no; viz. whether the Eſſenes in Egypt were Chriſtians, or not. Scaliger [b], Fuller [c], Godwin [d], Valeſius [e], Le Clerc [f], and generally *all the Proteſtants*, have rejected the authority of the Fathers in this point, and believe Philo's Eſſenes were not Chriſtians; on the other hand, *they of the Roman Church* generally hold the affirmative, ſuch as Bellarmine [g], Serarius, who has wrote very largely about it [h], and lately the learned Montfaucon [i]. I will not here enter into ſo large a diſpute; for my own part I believe neither of the contending parties perfectly in the right, nor their arguments on either ſide concluſive. I ſhall only deliver my own conjecture concerning the matter, which I think myſelf able, when there is occaſion, to ſupport by good arguments. What I mean is a ſort of compounding the matter thus, viz. 1. That when Philo wrote ſoon after our Saviour's

[a] Vid. Serar. Trihæreſ. lib. 3. c. 1. & Scaliger. Elench. Trihæreſ. c. 26. Fuller Miſcell. Sac. lib. 1. c. 3. lib. 2, c. 3. & lib. 4. c. 3.

[b] Prolegom. in Lib. de Emend. Temp. & lib. 6. p. 539.

[c] Locis jam citat.

[d] Moſes and Aaron. lib. 1. c. 12. in fine.

[e] In Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 2. c. 17.

[f] Prolegom. in Hiſt. Eccl. §. 1. c. 5. & 15.

[g] Vid. Serar. Trihæreſ. lib. 3. c. 17.

[h] Ibid. &c.

[i] Vid. Cleric. Loc. cit.

reſurrection,

reſurrection, *there were a great number of Jewiſh Eſſenes at Alexandria*; and though at that time Chriſtianity was not yet ſpread in Egypt (and ſo Philo could not mention the name of Chriſt or his Apoſtles), yet ſoon afterwards it was very much received in Alexandria.

2. *That the Jews were generally the firſt converts that were made to Chriſtianity, in every place where the Apoſtles went.* This has been already proved above [a].

3. *The principles of the Eſſenes there were ſuch as would be likely to influence them above all others to become Chriſtians.* This is plain out of Philo, eſpecially if we ſuppoſe there were any of the Gnoſticks, or diſciples of Saturninus, or their followers, in Egypt, as we know Simon Magus was, from whom they aroſe.

4. It ſeems therefore probable, that *ſome of theſe received Chriſtianity, and at the ſame time continued in their old way of living abſtemiouſly. Who can prove*, ſays a late writer [b], that *no Eſſenes embraced the faith of Chriſt, or that they could not do it, and yet retain their old ſentiments concerning meats and marriage?*

5. Hence Euſebius knowing certainly *there were ſome ſuch ſort* of Chriſtians in Egypt, might eaſily be induced to believe, *they were generally of the ſame ſort*, and conſequently the ſame of whom Philo wrote.

But if, after all, Euſebius ſhould not be in the right, nor the Fathers that followed him, nor my conjecture be juſt, it muſt at leaſt be certain, there was a very great agreement between theſe Egyptian Therapeutæ or Eſſenes, and the firſt Chriſtians in Egypt, in their cuſtoms, and ſo it only remains neceſſary to give ſome inſtances of this. I need only mention one for my preſent purpoſe, viz. that relating to their forbidding marriage; and as I have abundantly proved this of the moſt antient hereticks, ſo to ſhew the ſame of theſe Eſſenes or Therapeutæ. Joſephus relates this concerning them in ſeveral places [c] (though he indeed mentions a ſort of

[a] Part I. c. 2. p. 26.
[b] Dr. Whitby on 1 Tim. iv. 3.
[c] Antiqu. Jud. lib. 18. c. 2. & de Bell. Jud. lib. 2. c. 12.

them that did marry), ſo alſo did Pliny [a] and Philo ſeveral times [b]. Concerning the celibacy of the Egyptian Therapeutæ, I ſhall only recite one paſſage out of his book, *De Vitâ Contemplativâ*, page 899.

Συνεσιῶνται δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες, ὧν πλεῖσαι γεραιαὶ παρθένοι τὴν ἁγνείαν, οὐκ ἀνάγκῃ, καθάπερ ἔνιαι τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἱερειῶν, διαφυλάξασαι μᾶλλον, ἢ καθ' ἑκάσιον γνώμην, διὰ δὲ ζῆλον καὶ πόθον τῆς σοφίας, ᾗ συμβιῶσαι σπαδάσασαι, τῶν περὶ σῶμα ἡδονῶν ἠλόγησαν, ἀθνήτων ἐκγόνων, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτων ὀρεχθεῖσαι, &c.

Women alſo are admitted to their feaſts, moſt of which are old virgins, who preſerved their virginity not by compulſion, as ſome ſacred ones among the Heathen, but of their own accord, through their zealous deſire of wiſdom, in the conſtant purſuit of which, through their whole lives, they deſpiſed all carnal enjoyments, not deſiring mortal and periſhing children, but thoſe which are immortal.

It appears therefore from the antient opinion of the Egyptian Therapeutæ, that there were the ſame heretical doctrines of the unlawfulneſs of marriage among the Chriſtians in Egypt, as in other countries.

2. This farther appears probable from this conſideration, viz. *that monaſteries and the monkiſh way of life derive their firſt original from Egypt.* It is not at all ſtrange, that an abſtemiouſneſs, ſo great as that of the firſt Chriſtians in Egypt, above deſcribed, ſhould influence many zealous perſons to the like practices, and that theſe by degrees ſhould add many other things of the ſame nature. Serarius makes no doubt but they were the firſt beginners of the monaſtick life; it is enough to my purpoſe to obſerve, that the firſt certain evidences of this were in Egypt, in the latter end of the ſecond, or beginning of the third century. This Jerome tells us [c];

[a] Natural Hiſt. lib. 5. c. 17.

[b] See Serarius's Collections of their Dogmata.

[c] In Vit. Paul. Eremit. Par. 3. Tract. 8. de vit. contem. Epiſt. 37.

it

it has often been a queſtion, ſays he, *from whom the deſert way of life of the monks derives its original? Some derive it as far as from Elijah and John——Others (which is the prevailing opinion) from Antonius; which is in part true, for he was not ſo much the firſt in this way of life, as the means of propagating it; for Amathas and Macarius, two diſciples of Antonius, affirm, that one Paul of Thebais (in Egypt) was the chief author of this matter, which I alſo aſſent to.* Sozomen [a] follows the common opinion, and deduces it from Antonius, but he alſo lived in Egypt; but in a thing ſo well known I need produce no more authorities. An account of their way of living, and the means that Paul and Antonius promoted it, may be read in the places already cited, and the writers of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory in the third century [b]. Now hence I argue it as probable, that the Egyptian Chriſtians were *remarkable above others for their abſtemiouſneſs,* in the time before this Paul; elſe it is not likely he ſhould have influenced ſuch great numbers as he did, in ſo ſhort a time, to become his followers.

3. Perhaps it may not be abſurd to argue the ſame *from the deſign of the third book of Clemens Alexandrinus's Stromata, which is principally to confute thoſe hereticks, who denied the lawfulneſs of entering into a conjugal ſtate.* For inaſmuch as we do not find this argument inſiſted upon ſo largely by any of the writers of his, or the preceding century, it ſeems reaſonable to conclude theſe hereticks prevailed moſt in that country and place where he lived. This was Alexandria, the very place where Philo lived, and where his Therapeutæ were in the greateſt numbers. *They abound,* ſays he [c], *moſt in the provinces of Egypt, but eſpecially about Alexandria.*

Thirdly, *The remaining fragments of* the Goſpel according to the Egyptians *are all ſuch as were urged out of it by thoſe who held marriages and procreation of children ſinful, in order to countenance their errors in this reſpect.* This is evident from the paſſages themſelves, and what has been above ſaid

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 1. c. 12. et l. 6. c. 29.

[b] See eſpecially Spanheim. Hiſt. Eccl. Secul. III. p. 802.

[c] De Vit. Contemplat. p. 892.

concerning them. For inſtance, *the Goſpel of the Egyptians* makes Chriſt to approve celibacy and a ſingle life: the Egyptian Chriſtians forbad all marriages as unlawful; in the Goſpel of the Egyptians, Salome is introduced, as concluding from what our Saviour ſaid, that ſhe did well in bearing no children: among the Egyptian Chriſtians we find women celebrated for their virginity, and reſolution not to bear children. Once more, in the Egyptian Goſpel we find it the main reaſon aſſigned againſt bearing children, that they ſhould not be brought to trouble and death; ſo Philo ſays his Therapeutæ, who were the ſource and pattern of theſe Egyptian Chriſtians, deſired not to bear children, which ſhould periſh and die, &c.

I omit making the parallel between the old Chriſtian hereticks and Philo's Therapeutæ, in other inſtances of their abſtemiouſneſs, viz. their avoiding certain ſorts of meats, &c. becauſe we have no account of it in the remaining fragments of the Egyptian Goſpel, though I could eaſily ſhew there was ſuch agreement.

Laying therefore all theſe things together, and judging with a due impartiality, I think there is as much evidence as the nature of the ſubject will allow, that the Goſpel of the Egyptians was the forged compoſure of ſome imperfect Chriſtians, in Egypt, with deſign the better to recommend their plauſible doctrines of celibacy and abſtemiouſneſs under the names of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; eaſily perceiving, that whatever was publiſhed under ſo great names, would be more likely to impreſs and influence the minds of the people.

I have only farther to add, that the foregoing account ſeems to receive ſome ſtrength from the conſideration of the Goſpel of the Egyptians not being cited, nor even mentioned or known by any Chriſtians before the very end of the fourth century, but only Clemens and Origen, who both dwelt at Alexandria in Egypt. Thus much of this famous Goſpel, which I have taken more pains about than ordinary, becauſe it has been judged by many learned men not only a moſt antient, but valuable Goſpel, made uſe of by true primitive Chriſtians, and not by hereticks; but with what juſtice, let the reader now judge.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

The Acts of the Apoſtles made uſe of by the Ebionites. A Fragment of them. Mr. Toland's unfair Dealing cenſured. The Goſpel of the Ebionites.

Numb. XVII. The ACTS of the APOSTLES received by the EBIONITES.

ALTHOUGH we have very frequent mention in the antient writers of ſpurious Acts under the Apoſtles' names, yet I do not remember that any writer has either mentioned this, or hinted at any ſuch things as it contained, beſides Epiphanius. His account we have Hæreſ. 30. §. 16. viz. After having ſaid, the Ebionites make uſe of the ſame *Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew*, which alſo Cerinthus and Carpocras did uſe, as alſo *the Acts of Peter* written by Clemens, he adds:

Πράξεις δὲ ἄλλας καλοῦσιν Ἀποστόλων εἶναι, ἐν αἷς πολλὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ἔμπλεα, ἔνθεν τὰ ἑαυτῶν παρέργως κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἑαυτοὺς ὥπλισαν. Ἀναβαθμούς γάρ τινας, καὶ ὑφηγήσεις δῆθεν ἐν τοῖς ἀναβαθμοῖς Ἰακώβου ὑποτίθενται, ὡς ἐξηγημένους κατά τε τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν, κατά τε τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ κενοφωνίας ἔμπλεα· ὡς καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐνταῦθα κατηγορεῖντες ἂν αἰσχύνονται, ἐπιπλάστοις τισὶ τῆς τῶν ψευδαποστόλων αὐτῶν κακεργίας καὶ

But they have others, which they call *the Acts of the Apoſtles*, in which there are many of their wicked opinions, with which they carefully furniſh themſelves to oppoſe the truth. For they have there forged certain ſteps, and certain ſpeeches of James in each of them, in which he declares againſt the temple and ſacrifices, and the fire on the altar, beſides many other things perfectly ſilly and ridiculous: for inſtance, they had the impudence to accuſe Paul therein, by ſome falſe ſtories forged by the wickedneſs and deceit of their pre-

πλάνης

πλάνης λόγοις πεποιημένοις· Ταρσέα μὲν αὐτὸν, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ ἐκ ἀρνεῖται, λέγοντες, ἐξ Ἑλλήνων δὲ αὐτὸν ὑποτίθενται, λαβόντες τὴν πρόφασιν ἐκ τῆ τόπυ διὰ τὸ φιλάληθες ὑπ' αὐτῆ ῥηθὲν, ὅτι Ταρσεύς εἰμι, ἐκ ἀσήμυ πόλεως πολίτης. Εἶτα φάσκυσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἕλληνα, καὶ Ἑλληνίδος μητρὸς, καὶ Ἕλληνος πατρὸς παῖδα, ἀναβεβηκέναι δὲ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ χρόνον ἐκεῖ μεμενηκέναι· ἐπιτεθυμηκέναι δὲ θυγατέρα τῆ Ἱερέως πρὸς γάμον ἀγαγέσθαι, καὶ τότυ ἕνεκα προσήλυτον γενέσθαι καὶ περιτμηθῆναι. Εἶτα μὴ λαβόντα τὴν κόρην ὠργίσθαι, καὶ κατὰ τῆς περιτομῆς γεγραφέναι, καὶ κατὰ τῆ σαββάτυ, καὶ νομοθεσίας.

tended Apoſtles: for calling him a man of Tarſus (which he himſelf is ſo far from denying, that he expreſsly owns it), they falſely repreſent him as a Gentile, concluding ſo from that place, where he truly ſays, *I am a man of Tarſus, and a citizen of no mean city.* (See Acts xxi. 39.) Furthermore, they ſay he was a Gentile, and of Gentile parentage on both ſides; and that when he went up to Jeruſalem, and had ſtaid there ſome time, he had an inclination to marry the (High) Prieſt's daughter, and, on that account, became a proſelyte, and was circumciſed. But being diſappointed, and not obtaining the young lady, he was angry, and wrote againſt circumciſion, and the ſabbath, and the law (of Moſes).

Part of this fragment is produced by Mr. Toland in his *Original Plan or Scheme of Chriſtianity according to the Ebionites*[a], both in Greek and Engliſh; nor is it ſtrange that a perſon of Mr. Toland's profeſſion ſhould grace his ſcheme with a paſſage ſo much to his purpoſe, I mean of aboliſhing the doctrines of Chriſtianity, which are agreed upon by all Chriſtians, and introducing his moſt ridiculous and impious ſcheme of Nazarene, or Jewiſh, or Ebionite, or Mahometan, or (which is the undoubted truth) of no Chriſtianity at all. Did

[a] Nazaren. p. 35.

Mr.

Mr. Toland and his friends, in theſe their vile attacks upon ſo excellent and divine a conſtitution, not quibble and juggle, and prevaricate, as they upon all occaſions do, in their citations out of the old records of Chriſtianity (a crime which they are ever forward to charge upon others, who are much more clear of it), I ſhould excuſe myſelf and the reader from the trouble of any remarks upon them, leaving them to their ſlaviſh infidelity: but when I obſerve a perſon ranſacking and muſtering together all the ſilly trumpery of the antient hereticks, groſsly miſrepreſenting the books he cites, only with deſign to ſatisfy a bigotted humour againſt the Chriſtian religion, I am obliged, by my regards to the profeſſion I make of the name of Jeſus, to lay open ſuch vile impoſture. Of this I have given ſeveral inſtances already from Mr. Toland's books. The paſſage I am now upon out of Epiphanius furniſhes me with another. He would perſuade us, the Ebionites or Nazarenes (a moſt ridiculous ſort of hereticks, who ſcarcely deſerved the name of Chriſtians, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter) *were the only true and genuine Chriſtians, conſequently their books muſt be the trueſt and moſt genuine accounts of the Chriſtian affairs*; and ſo for inſtance muſt theſe Acts, which we are now diſcuſſing; becauſe it ſo much vilifies St. Paul, and expoſes his doctrine. But, as Dr. Mangey[a] has juſtly remarked, *this is moſt inſupportable impudence in him to cite as genuine a wretched forgery of the Ebionites.* One can ſcarce tell, whether his intention of vilifying St. Paul, or the method he uſeth to do ſo, be the more deteſtable: this ſorry unbelieving critick governs his ſkill by his wicked principles, and has no other way to judge of ſpurious and genuine books, than their oppoſition to Chriſtianity. Had this learned writer examined the paſſage in Epiphanius, I doubt not, he would have remarked more of Mr. Toland's inſincerity in this matter; for that Father, who is the only perſon that has mentioned this Apocryphal book, does almoſt in every ſentence reject it as a groſs and notorious forgery. Hence we meet with the words

[a] Remarks on Nazaren. c. 10. p. 83.

πολλὰ ἀσεβείας ἔμπλεα ὑποτίθενται, πολλὰ κενοφωνίας ἔμπλεα, ὑκ αἰσχύνονται ἐπιπλάσοις τισὶ τῶν ψευδαποστόλων κακεργίας, καὶ πλάνης λόγοις ἀπεοικμένοις, &c. which are all to this purpose; *that these Acts of the Ebionites were full of impious opinions, forged, silly and ridiculous, counterfeited by the imposture and wickedness of false Apostles, &c.* But all this Mr. Toland saw it proper to suppress. To have transcribed Epiphanius's account of the book, he was well aware, would have spoiled the credit of it, seeing he is the only writer, as I said, who has mentioned it; besides, it would have spoiled his own book, and so have touched him in the tender point of interest, if he had published this judgment of Epiphanius concerning the Ebionites and their books. Though therefore his design against Christianity be so notorious, and his method of executing it so unfair, yet the violence of the temptation was great. But I leave him.

These Acts of the Ebionites were certainly Apocryphal, being 1. *never heard of, nor read, nor received by any but those false sort of half Christians, called Ebionites.* Prop. IV, V, and VI. 2. *It appears to have contained things contrary to known and certain truths.* Such is the reason there given for Paul's preaching against justification by the ceremonial Law, viz. *his being exasperated against the Jews on account of his disappointment in a marriage with the High Priest's daughter*; for if this be true, then the whole of Paul's doctrine must be false, as not proceeding from God, but from the revengeful humour and rage of a disappointed lover. But this is contrary to the substance of Christianity, which has been proved to be true, by Prop. II. Coroll. 2. and the book therefore Apocryphal, by Prop. VIII. and Coroll. Again, though I have not indeed yet proved the truth of our Canon, yet what I have said Prop. II. is sufficient to give a credit to it superior to this spurious piece; and if so, it is certainly Apocryphal, because it contradicts several things therein, viz. *when it asserts Paul to be of Gentile parentage*, both in respect of father and mother, when as himself expressly declares the contrary more than once. So Acts xxiii. 6. *I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee*; Rom. xi. 1. *I am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin*; 2 Cor. xi. 22. *Are they Hebrews?*

brews? So am I. Are they Iſraelites? So am I. Are they the ſeed of Abraham? So am I. And once more, more fully; Phil. iii. 5. *I was circumciſed the eighth day, of the ſtock of Iſrael, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews*; which laſt words are a full demonſtration that his parents were both Jews, as Mr. Selden [a] has well proved, and the Greek conſtruction will moſt properly bear [b]. And this will lead me to another inſtance of the ſpuriouſneſs of theſe Acts, viz. *that they repreſent Paul as becoming a proſelyte, and being circumciſed on account of obtaining the Prieſt's daughter*, when as he was circumciſed the eighth day, and conſequently never was a Jewiſh proſelyte.

Numb. XVIII. The GOSPEL of the EBIONITES.

THIS appears evidently to have been either altogether, or very near, the ſame with *the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*; and therefore I ſhall refer the diſcuſſing it to its proper place under the letter N. where I ſhall diſtinctly conſider its variations from, or agreement with, the famous *Hebrew Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, and produce all its fragments.

CHAP. XVIII.

No peculiar Goſpel of the Encratites. The Goſpel of Eve a Forgery of the Gnoſticks.

Numb. XIX. The GOSPEL of the ENCRATITES.

IN this title I have followed Mr. Fabritius [c], and many others, though I confeſs it does not appear from any thing, which I have obſerved, that there ever was any Goſpel called by this name. The paſſage that learned writer produces out

[a] De Jur. Natur. & Gentium, lib. 2. c. 4.

[b] So in Xenophon we read ἐκ βασιλέως βασιλεύσειν. Orat. de Ageſil. c. 1. §. 2.

[c] Cod. Apocr. N. Teſt. tom. 1. p. 349. Vid. Feu-ardent. in Iren. lib. 3. c. 1.

of

of Epiphanius is in *his account of the Tatianites, or followers of Tatian, and their hereſy*, (Hæreſ. 46.) *and not in his account of the Encratites*; of whom he treats as a diſtinct ſect in the next book, viz. Hæreſ. 47. It is true, and appears evidently from Irenæus[a], Euſebius[b], and Epiphanius[c], that the Encratites and Tatianites agreed very much in the ſame principles, but it is as true alſo, they had ſome different principles; and therefore, perhaps, they might not receive the ſame Goſpel. Beſides, the Encratites were a ſect formed, as Irenæus[d] ſays, by Saturninus and Marcion, who lived before Tatian, who only built upon their foundation, and made ſome additions of his own; as that *concerning the damnation of Adam, which was not received by the antient Encratites.* It is therefore not juſt, to entitle the Goſpel of Tatian and his followers thus; wherefore I ſhall refer the diſcuſſion of it to its proper place under the title of Tatian, Numb. LXI.

Numb. XX. The GOSPEL of EVE.

THIS Apocryphal Goſpel has been obſerved by ſeveral modern writers, though, I believe, only by Epiphanius among the antients. It does not appear ſo much as named in the writings of Irenæus, or Clemens Alexandrinus; nor is it either in Origen, Ambroſe, Jerome, or Gelaſius's catalogues of the Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament. Epiphanius in his hereſy of the Gnoſticks[e] gives the following account and fragments of it.

Ἄλλοι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν πάλιν ἐπίπλασον εἰσάγουσιν ἀγώϊμόν τι ποίημα, ᾧ ποιητεύματι ἐπέθεντο ὄνομα Εὐαγγέλιον τελειώσεως——Ἄλλοι δὲ οὐκ αἰσχύνονται λέγοντες Εὐαγγέλιον Εὔας· εἰς ὄνομα γὰρ αὐ-

Some of them do produce a certain ſpurious and forged writing, which they call, *the Goſpel of Perfection*—Others have the impudence to produce one called *the Goſpel of Eve*; for under her name, as being reported to have receiv-

[a] Adv. Hæreſ. lib. 1. c. 30, 31.
[b] Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 28, 29.
[c] Hæreſ. 46, 47.
[d] Loc. jam. cit.
[e] Hæreſ. 26. §. 2, 3.

τῆς

τῆς δῆθεν ὡς εὑρέσης, τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γνώσεως ἐξ ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῇ ὄφεως σπορὰν ὑπολίθενται· καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν ἀσάτῳ γνώμῃ μεθύοντος, καὶ παρακαλοῦντος, ἐκ ἴσα εἴη τὰ ῥήματα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν γέλωτι πεποιημένα, ἕτερα δὲ κλαυθμοῦ ἔμπλεα, ἅτως ἡ τῶν ἀπατεώνων γέγονε κατὰ πάντα τρόπον, τῆς κακίας ἡ ὑποσπορά. Ὁρμῶνται δὲ ἀπὸ μωρῶν μαρτυριῶν, καὶ ὀπτασιῶν, ἐν ᾧ Εὐαγγελίῳ ἐπαγγέλλονται. Φάσκουσι γὰρ ἕτως, ὅτι ἔστην ἐπὶ ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ, καὶ εἶδον ἄνθρωπον μακρὸν, καὶ ἄλλον κολοβόν· καὶ ἤκουσα ὡσεὶ φωνὴν βροντῆς, καὶ ἤγγισα τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι, καὶ ἐλάλησε πρός με, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἐγὼ σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγώ· καὶ ἐγὼ σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγώ· καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν ἦς, ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ εἰμι, καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν εἰμι ἐσπαρμένος· καὶ ὅθεν ἐὰν θέλῃς συλλέγεις με, ἐμὲ δὲ συλλέγων ἑαυτὸν συλλέγεις· καὶ ὦ τῆς τοῦ Διαβόλου ὑποσπορᾶς!

ed great discoveries revealed to her in her discourse with the Serpent, they propagate their principles. But as the discourses of a person in drink, pretending to give advice, are according to his giddy fancy, not equal, but some of them merry, others melancholy, so are the wicked principles of these impostors. For they are led away with certain ridiculous testimonies and visions, which are in that Gospel which they make use of: they produce such as the following:—"I stood upon a "high mountain, and saw "one man very tall, and ano- "ther short (or lame). And "I heard a voice, as it were, "of a thunder, upon which I "went nearer to hear, and "he spake to me, saying, I "am what thou art, and thou "art what I am; (and again) "I am what thou art, and "thou art what I am; and "where thou art, there am I, "and I am in all places and "things: and whersoever "thou wilt, thou shalt find "*(gather)* me, and in find- "ing me, thou findest thy- "self." Behold, the doctrine of Devils!

I find

I find no farther account of this ſpurious Goſpel among the antients, nor indeed is there need of any more to prove it both Apocryphal and a ſilly forgery, as Father Simon[a] and Mr. Du Pin[b] have already obſerved. The words of the former are, *Some of this ſame ſect (viz. the Gnoſticks) that was divided into ſeveral branches, had invented a Goſpel entituled,* Εὐαγγέλιον Εὔας, The Goſpel of Eve, *wherein they ſcattered their wild conceits under the name of this woman, whom they conſidered as a perfect Gnoſtick, who had received great illuminations in the conference that ſhe held with the Serpent.* Mr. Du Pin expreſſes himſelf thus concerning it: *The Gnoſticks had likewiſe another Goſpel, more infamous than the former* (viz. the Goſpel of St. Philip), *which they called,* The Goſpel of Eve; *giving out, that from her they held the name of* Γνῶσις, *which ſhe had learnt from the Serpent.* In which laſt words, either Mr. Du Pin is miſtaken, or his Engliſh tranſlator has miſrepreſented him, which ſeems very probable both here and in many other places of the Engliſh editions of thoſe two writers. From the foregoing fragment of this Goſpel out of Epiphanius it is evident, how juſtly theſe French criticks pronounced it Apocryphal: it appears plainly to be ſuch by Prop. IV, V, and VI, as alſo by Prop. IX. *it containing things trifling and ridiculous,* and plainly forged to ſerve the turn of thoſe ſilly hereticks, who ſo much troubled the Church in the ſecond century. Nothing therefore can be more ridiculous, than that Mr. Toland[c] ſhould, to grace his catalogue of books, which he would have received with the ſame authority as thoſe of the preſent Canon, place this among them, in the following pompous words: *Nor ſhould we wonder at Judas's being an author, when we read of the Prophetical Goſpel of Eve, whom the Gnoſticks reckoned a patroneſs of their opinions, &c.* For neither does the book appear to have contained any thing which looked like prophecy, nor did the Gnoſticks themſelves pretend that Eve was its author.

[a] Critic. Hiſtor. of the N. Teſt. Par. 1. c. 3. p. 23.

[b] Hiſtory of the Canon, v. 2. c. 6. §. 5. p. 126.

[c] Amyntor, p. 33.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

The Gospel of the Hebrews. The Book of the Helkesaites, probably a Forgery of Elxai. Two Fragments of it. The Gospels of Hesychius no other than ours interpolated.

H.

Numb. XXI. The GOSPEL according to the HEBREWS.

THIS was without all controversy the same with *the Gospel according to the Nazarenes*; I shall therefore consider it under that title in the letter N.

Numb. XXII. The BOOK of the HELKESAITES.

IN the catalogue of Apocryphal books produced Part I. I produced this Book as mentioned by Eusebius; which, though indeed it be true, yet it should rather have been recited among those which are mentioned by Origen; for Eusebius in the place there cited takes his account out of his Homily on the eighty-second Psalm[a]; his words are (speaking concerning the hereticks called Helkesaites):

Καὶ βίβλον τινὰ φέρουσιν, ἣν λέγουσιν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταπεπτωκέναι· καὶ τὸν ἀκηκοότα ἐκείνης καὶ πιστεύοντα, ἄφεσιν λήψεσθαι τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, ἄλλην ἄφεσιν παρ' ἣν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἀφῆκε.

Besides, they produce a certain book, *which they affirm to have fallen down from heaven*; which they who observe and believe shall obtain the pardon of their sins; a pardon different from that which Jesus Christ bestowed.

These Helkesaites were a most ridiculous sect of Christians, who seem to have derived their name from Elxai, or Elxæus

[a] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 38.

(who lived in the time of Trajan, viz. about the year of Chriſt 114), a falſe prophet, who, according to Epiphanius, joined himſelf with the Ebionites and Nazarenes, and formed a ſect, entertaining the ſame principles with the Eſſenians and Sampſæans[a]. Epiphanius ſays, *they were neither Jews nor Chriſtians, nor Heathens, but a ſort of medley of each.* Their principles are ſo ridiculous, as not to deſerve tranſcribing. Origen, in the place cited, ſuppoſes them to have aroſe not long before his time; and adds, they rejected ſome things of every part of Scripture, but allowed none of Paul's writings. As to this book, I doubt not but it was the very ſame of which Epiphanius ſpeaks, that was written by Elxai, becauſe, as he ſays, it pretended to inſpiration, and wiſdom from God, Συνεγράψατο δὲ οὗτος βιβλίον ὄνθεν κατὰ προφητείαν, ἢ ὡς κατὰ ἔνθεον σοφίαν. It appears to have contained a ſort of ſyſtem of his ſhuffling and fooliſh doctrines: I ſhall only inſtance in thoſe which regarded our Saviour and the Holy Ghoſt, by which it is eaſy to judge of the whole compoſure.

Concerning Chriſt. Hæreſ. 19. §. 4.

Πολλά ἐστι τὰ αὐτῷ μυθολογήματα——διαγράφει δὲ Χριστὸν τινὰ εἶναι δύναμιν, ἧς καὶ τὰ μέτρα σημαίνει· εἰκοσιτεσσάρων μὲν σχοινίων τὸ μῆκος, ὡς μιλίων ἐνενήκοντα ἓξ, τὸ δὲ πλάτος σχοινίων ἓξ, μιλίων εἰκοσιτεσσάρων, καὶ τὸ πάχος ὁμοίως τετραπλευρούμενος, καὶ τὰς πόδας, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μυθολογήματα[b].

It contains many fabulous things, ſuch as the deſcription of Chriſt, viz. That he was a certain power (i. e. an inviſible body) whoſe dimenſions he aſſerts were as follow, viz. his height was twenty-four *(Schænia)* or Egyptian leagues, i. e. about ſixty-ſix miles, his breadth twenty four miles, and his thickneſs proportionably wonderful; ſo alſo his feet, with many other trifling accounts.

[a] Confer Hæreſ. 19. et 53.

[b] Concerning the word σχοινίων, and its being an Egyptian meaſure of 600 furlongs; ſee Herodot. lib. 2. §. 6.

Concerning

Concerning the Holy Ghost.

Εἶναι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ αὐτὸ θήλειαν, ὅμοιον τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀνδριάντος δίκην, ὑπὲρ νεφέλην, καὶ ἀναμέσον δύο ὀρέων ἑστώς.

The Holy Ghost is of the female kind, and like Christ, as the statue of a man, reaching above the clouds, and standing between two mountains.

He who would read more of this ridiculous author, may consult the place of Epiphanius just cited: it is sufficient to my purpose to observe, that the book was certainly Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, VI, VIII, and IX. I have only to add, that the hereticks under this name were generally of the Jewish nation, as Elxai himself, their founder, was; and therefore it is not strange, they should have thus forged immediate revelations from heaven. For about the time of this forgery, nothing was more common among the Jews than such pretences. The Jewish writers commonly say, *there were three sorts of revelations antiently among them*; the first *by Urim and Thummim, which was in use from the erecting of the Tabernacle until the building of the Temple*; the second, *by the Spirit of Prophecy, from the beginning of the world, but mostly under the first Temple, until the death of Malachi under the second Temple*; the third *by* קול בת, *Bath Kol, i. e. by voices from heaven, succeeding the former, and continuing in use thenceforward*; concerning which it may be well worth while to read what Dr. Lightfoot [a], and after him Dean Prideaux [b] have wrote.

Numb. XXIII. The GOSPELS of HESYCHIUS.

THE reason, which induced me to mention these Gospels under a distinct title, is, that I find them so mentioned in the Decree of Pope Gelasius, among the rest of the Apocryphal books of the New Testament, though I think it very evident, that they were no other than some interpolated copies

[a] Hor. Hebr. in Matth. iii. 17.
[b] Connect. of the History of the Old and New Testam. par. 2. b. 4. p. 328, &c.

of our preſent Goſpels, as will appear from the authors who have mentioned them, viz.

1. Jerome, who in the Preface to his Tranſlation of the Goſpels into Latin, after having ſhewed the neceſſity of it, adds [a]:

Prætermitto eos codices quos a Luciano & Heſychio nuncupatos, paucorum hominum aſſerit perverſa contentio, quibus utique nec in toto Veteri Teſtamento poſt Septuaginta Interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in Novo profuit emendâſſe; cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante tranſlata doceat falſa eſſe quæ addita ſunt.

I take no notice of thoſe books which go under the names of Lucian and Heſychius, and are eſteemed through the perverſe humours of ſome. For as they were not able to make any amendments to the Septuagint Verſion in any part of the Old Teſtament, ſo neither were their amendments of the New of any value, ſeeing the former tranſlations of the Scripture into all the languages of the world prove their additions or interpolations to be falſe.

2. Pope Gelaſius's words are [b];

Evangelia, quæ falſavit Heſychius, Apocrypha.

The Goſpels, which were interpolated by Heſychius, are Apocryphal.

From theſe accounts it is manifeſt, theſe Goſpels of Heſychius were no other than our preſent Canonical Goſpels, with ſome additions of his: for as Jerome cenſures their work, as containing *uſeleſs amendments and additions*, ſo the word *falſavit* in Gelaſius implies the ſame. What theſe interpolations were, there is not any poſſibility of our conjecturing now, though I know not whether it be worth while to lament the loſs of them ſo much as Dr. Mill does [c]: "It is much to be

[a] Præfat. in Evang. ad Damas.
[b] In Decret.
[c] Prolegom. in N. Teſt. §. 728.

"lamented,"

"lamented," ſays he, "that Jerome, who is the only perſon "that I know (beſides Gelaſius who tranſcribed from him) "that has ſaid any thing of this forgery, has given us no more "clear and full account of this matter." I ſee not any great advantage it would have been, had theſe corrupt copies been preſerved. It is probable enough, *what he added was no more than ſome idle ſtories out of the Goſpel of the Egyptians*, it being generally thought, with good reaſon, that this Heſychius was that Egyptian martyr mentioned by Euſebius [a], *whoſe Greek copies of the Old Teſtament were*, as Jerome ſays, *generally received in Egypt* [b]. This, however, is certain; theſe falſe Goſpels were only received by ſome few perſons of perverſe minds, and rejected by the main body of Chriſtians, and therefore to be eſteemed Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, VI. but eſpecially by Prop. XIV.

CHAP. XX.

The Book of James not the ſame with the Prot-Evangelium under his Name. A common Opinion among the Antients, that the Brethren of Chriſt mentioned in the Goſpels were Joſeph's Children by a Wife before Mary. Other Books attributed to James, which were the forgery of Leucius Charinus. The Acts and Books of John. The Goſpel of Judas Iſcariot.

I.

Numb. XXIV. The BOOK of JAMES.

UNDER the name of this Apoſtle there have been ſeveral ſpurious and forged pieces, of which it is not now eaſy to form a diſtinct and clear account. The title of this now under enquiry I have taken from Origen [c], who in his

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 8. c. 13. Confer Uſſer. Syntag. de Edit. LXX. c. 7. and Dr. Cave Hiſtor. Liter. vol. 1. in Heſych. p. 808.

[b] Epiſt. ad Chromat. quæ eſt Præfat. in Lib. Paralip.

[c] Orig. Op. Exeg. p. 223.

Commentary on thoſe words of St. Matthew, c. xiii. 55. *Is not this the Carpenter's Son? Is not his Mother called Mary? and his Brethren James and Joſes, and Simon and Judas?* has the following paſſage.

Τὰς δὲ ἀδελφὰς Ἰησοῦ φασί τινες εἶναι ἐκ παραδόσεως ὁρμώμενοι τῶν ἐπιγεγραμμένων κατὰ Πέτρου Εὐαγγελίων, ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου, υἱὸς Ἰωσὴφ ἐκ προτέρας γυναικὸς συνῳκηκυίας αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας.

There are ſome who ſay the brethren of Chriſt (here mentioned) were the children of Joſeph by a former wife, who lived with him before Mary; and they are induced to this opinion by ſome paſſages in that which is intitled, The Goſpel of Peter, or the Book of James.

Our learned countryman Dr. Mill[a], after ſeveral others, is of the opinion, that the Book of James here referred to is for the moſt part the ſame with the *Prot-Evangelion under this Apoſtle's name*, which is now extant, and which I ſhall inſert in Greek and Engliſh in the third part of this work: but I think this can hardly be proved by any good arguments, becauſe it does not appear this Prot-Evangelion was extant until long after Origen's time, as I ſhall ſhew in the particular diſcuſſion of it. I confeſs I have obſerved in this book *an account of Joſeph's having children by a former wife*; for he is introduced cap. ix. as anſwering the High-prieſt urging him to take the virgin, Υἱοὺς ἔχω, καὶ πρεσβύτης εἰμὶ, αὐτὴ δὲ νεανίς· μήπως ἔσομαι κατάγελως τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ. *I have children, and am an old man, but ſhe is young, and I ſhall appear ridiculous in Iſrael.* But, notwithſtanding this, it is for the forementioned reaſon probable, theſe two books were not the ſame; beſides, Origen does not ſeem to have ſeen this book of James, but was uncertain whether the opinion he cites was *in that* or *the Goſpel of Peter*; and laſtly, this was a very common opinion among the Antients, viz. *that Joſeph had children by a former wife*[b],

[a] Prolegom. in N. Teſt. §. 274.

[b] See Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 2. c. 1. Epiphan. Hæreſ. 29. Nazar. & 78. quæ eſt Antidicomar. and many other antients cited to this purpoſe by Valeſ. in Loc. Euſeb. and Biſhop Pearſon on the Creed. Art. 3. p. 174, &c.

and

and ſo might very probably have been in ſeveral of the ſpurious and Apocryphal pieces. And this is no more than what Jerome [a] expreſsly ſays, *Some ſuppoſe, by the brethren of our Lord we are to underſtand Joſeph's children by another wife, following the idle fancies of ſome Apocryphal books.* However this be, we have the juſteſt reaſon to eſteem this book of James to have been a ſpurious piece, and Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, VI.

Numb. XXV. Some other BOOKS attributed to JAMES.

EPIPHANIUS, in his account of the Ebionites [b], after a large confutation of their principles, adds:

Τῶν δὲ Ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματα εἰς τὴν τῶν ἠπατημένων ὑπ' αὐτῶν πειθὼ προσποιητῶς δέχονται· βίβλους τε ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν πλασάμενοι ἀνεγράψαντο, δῆθεν ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰακώβου, καὶ Ματθαίου, καὶ ἄλλων μαθητῶν, ἐν οἷς ὀνόμασι καὶ τὸ ὄνομα Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἐγκαταλέγουσιν, ἵνα πανταχόθεν φορατὴ γένηται ἡ αὐτῶν ἄνοια.

Beſides they have counterfeited the Apoſtles' names, for the better perſuading of thoſe, whom they have deluded; for they have forged ſeveral books, and prefixed their names to them, viz. the name of James, Matthew, and other Diſciples, among which is alſo the name of the Apoſtle John, that their folly might appear every where the greater.

I am not able to ſay any thing particular concerning theſe books, there being no fragments of them now extant; only, if I may conjecture, I would ſay, they were the ſame with thoſe mentioned by Pope Innocent I. [c] in his Decree concerning Canonical books.

Qui vero Libri recipiantur in Canone Sanctarum Scripturarum, brevis annexus oſtendit. Hæc ſunt ergo quæ deſiderata

What books are to be received into the Canon of the ſacred Scriptures, the annexed ſchedule will declare—Theſe

[a] Commen. in Matth. xii. 49.
[b] Hæreſ. 30. §. 23.
[c] Epiſt. 3. ad Exuper. c. 7.

moneri vôce voluiſti: Moyſis libri quinque, &c. Cætera autem quæ vel ſub nomine Matthæi ſive Jacobi Minoris, vel ſub nomine Petri & Joannis, quæ a quodam Leucio ſcripta ſunt, &c. non ſolum repudianda, verum noveris eſſe damnanda.

are they, concerning which you deſired to be informed, viz. The five books of Moſes, &c. But as for thoſe which go under the name of Matthew, or James the Leſs, or under the name of Peter and John, which were wrote by one Leucius, know, that they are not only to be rejected, but condemned.

Whether theſe words will prove that Leucius was the author of theſe books under the name of James, or whether they only aſſert thoſe aſcribed to Peter and John to have been written by Leucius, is not very eaſy to determine. The former appeared moſt probable to Dr. Mill[a], and perhaps not without reaſon, if we conſider, that this Leucius was the author of a great many forgeries under the Apoſtle's name, as will appear fully hereafter under the letter L. Although therefore there is nothing more particular known concerning theſe books, yet from what is ſaid, it is plain, they were ſpurious, and conſequently Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI. It may perhaps be objected, that Leucius cannot be ſuppoſed to be the author of theſe books, and conſequently that Epiphanius and Pope Innocent do not mean the ſame, becauſe *the former ſays, they were forged by the Ebionites, but it does not appear that Leucius was one of this ſort.* To which I ſhall think it enough to anſwer, that Leucius ſeems to have formed his books with deſign to be received by all ſorts of hereticks, and, therefore, mixed the peculiar principles of each moſt celebrated party together in them; whence, as *the incomparable and moſt excellent writer among the antients*, I mean Photius, *the Patriarch of Conſtantinople*, obſerves, *his forgeries are full of fooliſh and ſilly contradictions, and he may be juſtly eſteemed as the ſource or author of every hereſy*[b].

[a] Prolegom. in N. Teſt. §. 336.

[b] Γέμει δὲ καὶ μωρίας πολλῆς, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὴν μάχης ἡ ἐναντιώσεως—Πάσης αἱρέσεως πηγὴν καὶ μητέρα. Cod. cxiv.

Numb.

Numb. XXVI. The ACTS of JOHN the APOSTLE.

OF theſe ſpurious Acts there is frequent mention in the old Chriſtian writers, who lived within the limits of my time; but inaſmuch as they appear evidently to have been the forgery of Leucius, I ſhall refer the conſideration of them to their proper place under the name Leucius in the letter L.

Numb. XXVII. Other BOOKS under the Name of JOHN.

THESE appearing to have been compoſed by the ſame perſon with the former, ſhall be conſidered in the ſame place.

Numb. XXVIII. The GOSPEL of JUDAS ISCARIOT.

THIS Apocryphal book is mentioned by Irenæus and Epiphanius, as peculiar to one of the moſt monſtrous and inconſiſtent ſects, who ever took upon them the Chriſtian name. The account given by Irenæus is as follows [a].

Alii autem rurſus Cain a ſuperiore principalitate dicunt; & Eſau & Core & Sodomitas, & omnes tales cognatos ſuos confitentur, & propter hoc a Factore impugnatos neminem ex eis male acceptos: Sophia enim illud, quod proprium ex ea erat, abripiebat ex eis ad ſemetipſam. Et hæc Judam proditorem diligenter cognoviſſe dicunt, & ſolum præ cæteris cognoſcentem veritatem

But there are other hereticks, who ſay, Cain (was delivered [b]) by a Heavenly Power, and who acknowledge Eſau, Corah, and the Sodomites as their pattern (or kindred), who though they were fought againſt by the Creator, yet received no damage thereby: for Wiſdom took from them whatever belonged to it. Theſe things, they ſay, Judas, who betrayed Chriſt, careful-

[a] Adv. Hæreſ. lib. 1. c. 35.

[b] I ſupply this word out of Theodoret, ſome word being neceſſary to be ſupplied to make the ſentence perfect.

perfeciſſe

perfeciſſe proditionis myſterium; per quem & terrena & cæleſtia omnia diſſoluta dicunt, & confictionem afferunt hujuſmodi, Judæ Evangelium illud vocantes.

ly obtained the knowledge of; and as he was the only one of the Apoſtles who knew the truth, he accompliſhed the myſtery of betraying Chriſt. By him (viz. Judas) they ſay, all things in heaven and earth were diſſolved; and agreeable to theſe ſentiments they produce a certain forgery, which they call the *Goſpel of Judas*.

Epiphanius diſcourſing of theſe ſame hereticks relates[a] much the ſame thing as Irenæus, and in the ſame myſtical unintelligible language; of which he in like manner ſays, they affirmed Judas to have had a perfect knowledge; adding,

Καὶ τέτον γὰρ θέλεσιν εἶναι συγγενῆ ἑαυτῶν, καὶ ἐν γνώσεως ὑπερβολῇ τὸν αὐτὸν καταρτισθῆσιν, ὥςε καὶ συνταγμάτιόν τι φέρειν ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῦ, ὃ Εὐαγγέλιον τῦ Ἰέδα καλῦσι· καὶ ἄλλα τινα συγγράμματα ὡσαύτως πλάσαντα, &c.

That they will have him to be their relation, and eſteem him to have obtained extraordinary knowledge, inaſmuch as they produce a certain book under his name, which they call the *Goſpel of Judas*; beſides, they have forged many other ſuch writings, &c.

Mr. Toland has not failed to adorn his catalogue of Books, which he would perſuade us are as valuable as any now received, with the title of this Goſpel[b]: he has introduced it thus: *That none of the Apoſtles might be thought unable to write a Goſpel, we find one alledged by the Caianites, a ſect of the Gnoſticks, under the name of Judas Iſcariot.* Artfully ſaid indeed! A ſet of impious, beaſtly, prophane wretches, abandoned to all the exceſſes of vice and immorality, forged a piece under the name of Judas; and this is to be ranked in the ſame claſs

[a] Hæreſ. 38. §. 1. [b] Amyntor, p. 33.

with

with thoſe which contain the ſublime doctrines and holy precepts of Chriſtianity! But let us a little ſee what ſort of perſons theſe Caianites were: *They called the Creator of all things Hyſtera, and wrote ſeveral books againſt him; they affirmed, no man could be ſaved, who did not make trial of all ſorts of vice; accordingly they reckoned it virtue to commit the moſt notorious immoralities and crimes; and feigning to themſelves a great number of Angels, they attributed to each a particular ſin, which when they were about to commit, they invoked that Angel's regard and patronage: they applauded the action of Judas in betraying Chriſt* [a], *&c.* Such were their ridiculous ſentiments; from whence it is eaſy to form a notion of their Goſpel, and to ſee reaſon to reject it. See Prop. IV, V, VI, and eſpecially VIII. and IX.

[a] He who has a mind, may read this, and more of the ſame ridiculous kind, in the places of Irenæus and Epiphanius laſt cited.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

The Acts of the Apoſtles under the Names of Leucius, Lentitius, Leontius, and Leuthon, proved to be one and the ſame Book, becauſe theſe were all the ſame Perſon's Name corruptly written. They contained the Acts of John, Andrew, Thomas, Peter, Paul, James, and others. Their Spuriouſneſs proved. Leucius their Author lived in the fourth Century. His Principles and Tenets. A Remark on Dr. Mill's Greek Teſtament. Leucius and Leonides the ſame Name. Leonides proved to be a corrupt Writing inſtead of Leucius. Nexocharis or Xenocharis proved to be a corrupt Way of writing Charinus, the Surname of Leucius.

Numb. XXIX. The ACTS of the APOSTLES by LEUCIUS.

Numb. XXX. The ACTS of the APOSTLES by LENTITIUS.

Numb. XXXI. The ACTS of the APOSTLES by LEONTIUS.

Numb. XXXII. The ACTS of the APOSTLES by LEUTHON.

Numb. XXXIII. The BOOKS of LENTITIUS.

EACH of theſe differing titles being to be found in the antient writings, I thought it moſt agreeable to my deſign to produce them diſtinctly, though they are unqueſtionably only miſtaken writings of the ſame perſon's name, viz. Leucius. I ſhall, according to my method, firſt produce the places, and then form the beſt judgment of them which I can. The firſt is that of,

I. St. Auſtin, who gives the following account of *the Acts under the Apoſtles' names written by Leucius*, received by the Manichees [a].

[a] Lib. de Fid. cont. Manich. c. 38.

Multum

Multum apparet imperitia veſtra, vel potius audacia. Attendite in actibus Leucii, quos ſub nomine Apoſtolorum ſcribit, qualia ſint, quæ accipitis de Maximilla uxore Egetis; quæ quum nollet marito debitum reddere, quum Apoſtolus dixerit, uxori vir debitum reddat, ſimiliter & uxor viro; illa ſuppoſuerit marito ſuo ancillam ſuam, Eucliam nomine, exornans eam, ſicut ibi ſcriptum eſt, adverſariis lenociniis & fucationibus, & eam nocte pro ſe vicariam ſupponens, ut ille neſciens cum ea tanquam cum uxore concumberet. Ibi etiam ſcriptum eſt, quod cum eadem Maximilla & Iphidamia ſimul iiſſent ad audiendum Apoſtolum Andream, puerulus quidam ſpecioſus, quem vult Leucius vel Deum vel certe Angelum intelligi, commendaverit eas Andreæ Apoſtolo, & perrexerit ad prætorium Egetis, & ingreſſus cubiculum eorum finxerit vocem muliebrem, quaſi Maximillæ murmurantis de doloribus ſexus fæminei, & Iphi-

Your imprudence, or rather impudence, appears very remarkable. Conſider only, what ſort of things you receive concerning Maximilla, the wife of Egetes, *in the Acts of Leucius, which he wrote under the Apoſtles' name.* How that when ſhe would not render due benevolence to her huſband, according to the Apoſtle's command (1 Cor. vii. 3.) *Let a man render due benevolence to his wife, and likewiſe the wife to her huſband,* ſhe impoſed upon her huſband by her maid called Euclia. For, as it it written there, ſhe adorned her, and by artful diſguiſes deluded her huſband, by placing her in the night in her own place, ſo that he ignorantly lay with her as his wife. It is there alſo written, that when the ſame Maximilla and Iphidamia went together to hear the Apoſtle Andrew, a certain handſome boy, whom Leucius will have either to have been God himſelf, or at leaſt an angel, recommended them to Andrew the Apoſtle, and having led them to the palace of Egetes, went into their bed-chamber, and feigned the voice of a woman, like Maximilla's, bemoaning the misfortunes of her ſex; to

damiæ

damiæ reſpondentis. Quæ colloquia cum audiſſet Egetes, credens eas ibi eſſe, diſceſſerit.

which Iphidamia replied.— Which diſcourſes when Egetes heard, believing them to be really theirs, he went away [a].

II. The ſame St. Auſtin [b], diſputing with Felix againſt the Manichees, urges againſt him:

Habetis hoc etiam in ſcripturis Apocryphis, quas Canon quidem catholicus non admittit, vobis autem tanto gratiores ſunt, quanto a Catholico Canone ſecluduntur. Aliquid etiam inde commemorem, cujus ego auctoritate non teneor, ſed tu convinceris. In Actibus conſcriptis a Lentitio, quos tanquam actus Apoſtolorum ſcribit, habes ita poſitum: Etenim ſpecioſa figmenta & oſtentatio ſimulata, & coactio viſibilium, non quidem ex propria natura procedunt, ſed ex eo homine qui per ſe ipſum deterior factus eſt per ſeductionem.

This you have alſo in the Apocryphal writings, which are not admitted into the Canon of the Church, but are indeed ſo much the more eſteemed by you, as they are excluded the Canon of the Church. I ſhall cite a paſſage thence, not that I regard its authority, but for your conviction. *In the Acts wrote by Lentitius, which he writes as the Acts of the Apoſtles*, you find the following words: "The ſpecious appearances "and deluſive pomp, and the "influence of the things that "are ſeen, do not proceed "from nature, but from that "man, who through his own "fault became worſe by "temptation."

III. The ſame Father in his treatiſe *of Faith*, or *the Trinity of the Unity*, produces the ſame paſſage with no variation; only that the author's name is there written Leontius, and not Lentitius, as in the place laſt cited: His words are, *In actibus*

[a] Something of this is referred to in the Life of Andrew. See Abdias's Hiſt. Apoſt. in vit. And. c. 39.

[b] Act. cum Felic. Manich. lib. 2. c. 6.

etiam

etiam conſcriptis a Leontio, quos ipſi accipiunt, ſic ſcriptum eſt; Etenim ſpecioſa figmenta &c.[a] Whence it is evident, that theſe two names denote the ſame perſon; not that he was antiently known by both theſe names, but through the ignorance or inadvertency of latter ſcribes, when they found the name Leucius contractedly wrote thus, L. or Lus. according to the old way in manuſcripts, they ſubſtituted either Leucius, Lentitius, or Leontius, according to their own fancy.

IV. Jerome, or whoever was the author of that famous Epiſtle to Chromatius and Heliodorus under his name among his works[b], aſcribes not only the book of the Nativity of Mary, but that called, *The Acts or Paſſions of the Apoſtles*, to Leuthon, as it is in my edition, or as it is in others, Seleucus, who was the ſame as Leucius, as has been often obſerved; ſee Caſaubon[c], Fabritius[d], and others; and ſo Dr. Mill aſſures us, the manuſcript copies ſtill have the name Leucius, and neither Leuthon nor Seleucus[e]: ſo that I may now ſet down the words of the Epiſtle under Jerome's name.

Sed factum eſt, ut a Manichæi diſcipulo, nomine Leucio, qui etiam Geſta Apoſtolorum falſo ſermone concripſit, hic liber editus, &c.

But it is certain that this book was publiſhed, &c. by a diſciple of Manichæus, whoſe name was Leucius, who alſo wrote a falſe account, intitled, *The Acts of the Apoſtles.*

Hence it is evident there were certain Acts under the Apoſtles' names wrote by Leucius. It remains now, that we more particularly make enquiry what thoſe Acts were.

To me it ſeems certain, *they were the very ſame with thoſe Apocryphal Acts which are ſo often mentioned by the antient writers, as forged under the names of John, Andrew, and Thomas*, and perhaps two or three more. I ſhall make good my aſſertion by theſe following reaſons:

[a] Lib. de Fid. cont. Manich. c. 5.

[b] Epiſtol. 82. Par. 2. Tract 6. fol. 140.

[c] Exercit. 1. ad Apparat. Baron. Annal. 15. No. 39.

[d] Cod. Apoc. Nov. Teſtam. p. 137. par. 1.

[e] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. § 336.

1. *From*

1. *From the express testimony of Photius*, that most accurate and judicious critick, who had read the books, and asserts, that *they manifested Leucius Charinus to be their author* [a].

Ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλίον, αἱ λεγόμεναι τῶν Ἀποστόλων περίοδοι, ἐν αἷς περιείχοντο πράξεις Πέτρου, Ἰωάννου, Ἀνδρέου, Θωμᾶ, Παύλου. Γράφει δὲ αὐτὰς, ὡς δηλοῖ τὸ αὐτὸ βιβλίον, Λεύχιος Χαρῖνος.

I read the book which is called *the Acts of the Apostles*, among which are contained *the Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, Paul*; the writer of which, as appears plainly from the book, was Leucius Charinus.

2. *From the Decree of Pope Innocent* [b], in which several books under these Apostles' names are joined together, as wrote by this same Leucius; *Cætera quæ sub nomine Petri & Joannis, quæ a quodam Leucio scripta sunt, &c. As to the other books under the name of John, which were written by one Leucius, &c.* See the passage at large above, Numb. XXV.

3. St. Austin, who says the Manichees made their citations out of the Acts of the Apostles written by Leucius, in the places just now cited; in another book [c] says, *they made their citations out of some Apocryphal pieces under the names of Andrew and John.*

4. *They were received by several hereticks, who agreed in many of the same impious principles.* This is evident by the table which I have composed of this agreement in Chap. V. of this part, and the authors there cited, who mention the Acts of Andrew and John together, as received by the Manichees, Encratites, Apostolicks or Apotactick, and Origenians.

These therefore appearing so evidently to be the same, I shall in the next place produce the places where they are mentioned, viz.

[a] Cod. cxiv.

[b] Epist. 3. ad Exuper. Episcop. Tolos. c. 7.

[c] Sane de Apocryphis iste posuit testimonia, quæ sub nominibus Apostolorum Andreæ, Johannisque conscripta sunt. Contr. adverss. leg. & proph. lib. 1. c. 20. in init.

1. By

1. By Euſebius [a].

Ἵν' εἰδέναι ἔχοιμεν—τὰς ὀνόματι τῶν Ἀποστόλων πρὸς τῶν αἱρετικῶν προφερομένας, ἤτοι ὡς Πέτρε, καὶ Θωμᾶ, καὶ Ματθία, ἢ καί τινων ἄλλων παρὰ τάτες Εὐαγγέλια περιεχόσας, ἢ ὡς Ἀνδρέα καὶ Ἰωάννε, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀποστόλων πράξεις, ὧν οὐδεὶς ἐδαμῶς ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὰς Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνὴρ εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἠξίωσεν· πόρρω δέ πε καὶ ὁ τῆς φράσεως παρὰ τὸ ἦθος τὸ Ἀποστολικὸν ἐναλλάττει χαρακτὴρ, ἥ τε γνώμη καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς φερομένων προαίρεσις, πλεῖστον ὅσον τῆς ἀληθοῦς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀπᾴδουσα, ὅτι δὴ αἱρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀναπλάσματα τυγχάνει, σαφῶς παρίστησιν, ὅθεν οὐδ' ἐν νόθοις αὐτὰ κατατακτέον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄτοπα πάντη καὶ δυσσεβῆ παραιτητέον.

That we may know——the books publiſhed by the hereticks under the Apoſtles' names, ſuch as the Goſpels of *Peter*, *Thomas*, *Matthias*, and ſome others, and alſo *the Acts of Andrew and John and ſome other Apoſtles*, which were never eſteemed valuable enough to be cited in the works of any Eccleſiaſtical writer: beſides, the phraſeology of them is very different from the Apoſtles' ſtyle; and withal, the doctrines and ſentiments, which they contain, are ſo very oppoſite to the Orthodox faith, as evidently to demonſtrate that they are the forgeries of hereticks, and ſo not only to be looked upon as ſpurious, but to be utterly rejected as abſurd and impious.

By Athanaſius [b].

Τῆς νέας Διαθήκης ἀνθιλεγόμενα ταῦτα. Περίοδοι Πέτρε, περίοδοι Ἰωάννε, περίοδοι Θωμᾶ, Εὐαγγέλιον καλὰ Θωμᾶ, διδαχὴ

The Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament are theſe: *The Acts of Peter*, *the Acts of John*, *the Acts of Thomas*, *the*

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.
[b] In Synopſ. or whoever was the author of that antient book.

Ἀποςόλων, Κλημέντια—παραλελεγραμμένα δέ εἰσι πάντως, καὶ νόθα, καὶ ἀπόβλητα. Καὶ εἶδεν τάτων τῶν Ἀποκρύφων μάλιςα ἔγκριτον ἢ ἐπωφελὲς, ἐξαιρέτως τῆς νέας Διαθήκης· ἀλλὰ πάντα, δίχα τῶν ἀνωτέρω διαληφθέντων καὶ ἐγκριθέντων παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ Πατράσιν, Ἀποκρυφῆς μᾶλλον ἢ ἀναγνώσεως ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄξια· τάτε ἄλλα, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ καλάμενα ἐν αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγέλια, ἐκτὸς τῶν παραδοθέντων ἡμῖν τεσσάρων τάτων.

Goſpel according to Thomas, the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, and the books under Clement's name. They are all falſe, ſpurious, and to be rejected. And none of thoſe Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament have been either approved, or are uſeful; but they have all been judged Apocryphal (i. e. rather worthy to be concealed than read) by the antient Wiſe Men and Fathers, which contain any thing contrary to the books above recited[a]; as alſo all other Goſpels, beſides thoſe four delivered to us.

By Philaſtrius[b].

E quibus ſunt Manichæi, Gnoſtici, Nicolaitæ, Valentiniani, et alii quamplurimi, qui Apocrypha Apoſtolorum, i. e. ſeparatos Actus habentes, Canonicas legere Scripturas contemnunt—Scripturæ autem abſconditæ, i. e. Apocrypha, etſi legi debent morum cauſa a perfectis, non legi debent ab omnibus, quia non intelligentes multa addiderunt

Among whom are the Manichees, Gnoſticks, Nicolaitans, Valentinians, and many others, who having ſome Apocryphal books under the Apoſtles' names, i. e. ſome diſtinct Acts, deſpiſe the Canonical Scriptures as not worthy to be read: but theſe ſecret, i. e. Apocryphal Scriptures, though for the conduct of life they ought to be read by the more able Chriſtians, yet ought not to be read by all, becauſe the ignorant hereticks have added

[a] He refers to the catalogue he had given before of Canonical books.

[b] Hæreſ. 40. cui titul. Apocryphi.

& tu-

& tulerunt, quæ voluerunt hæretici. Nam Manichæi Apocrypha beati Andreæ Apoſtoli, i. e. Actus quos fecit veniens de Ponto in Græciam, quos conſcripſerunt diſcipuli tunc ſequentes Apoſtolum; unde & habent Manichæi & alii tales, Andreæ beati & Joannis Actus Evangeliſtæ, beati & Petri ſimiliter Apoſtoli, & Pauli pariter Apoſtoli; in quibus quia ſigna fecerunt magna & prodigia, ut & canes & beſtiæ loquerentur, etiam & animas hominum tales velut canum & pecudum ſimiles imputaverunt eſſe hæretici perditi.

and taken away many things, according to their own fancies. For the Manichees (make uſe) of Apocryphal books under the name of *St. Andrew the Apoſtle, i. e. the Acts which he did in his journey from Pontus to Greece*, which the Diſciples, who followed that Apoſtle, wrote: So alſo the Manichees and other ſuch (hereticks) have the *Acts of St. Andrew and John the Evangeliſt; alſo of St. Peter the Apoſtle, and the Apoſtle Paul*; in which, becauſe they wrought many miracles, ſuch as making dogs and beaſts to ſpeak, thoſe wretched hereticks imagined the ſouls of men to be like the ſouls of dogs and beaſts.

4. By Epiphanius [a], ſpeaking concerning the Encratites.

Κέχρηνται δὲ γραφαῖς μᾶλλον τύπως ταῖς λεγομέναις Ἀνδρέᾳ καὶ Ἰωάννᾳ πράξεσι, καὶ Θωμᾷ, καὶ Ἀποκρύφοις τισί.

They principally made uſe of thoſe Scriptures, which were called the Acts of Andrew, and John, and Thomas, and ſome other Apocryphal pieces.

The ſame author, in the hereſy of the Apotactticks and Origenians, ſays, they made uſe of the ſame book; the paſſages are produced above, in the place referred to in the margin [b].

[a] Hæreſ. 47. §. 1. [b] Part 2. c. 5.

5. By Pope Gelaſius [a].

Libri omnes quos fecit Lentitius, ſeu Leucius, filius Diaboli, Apocryphi.	All the books which were made by Lentitius, or Leucius, that ſon of the Devil, are Apocryphal.

Theſe are all the places which I have obſerved, in which theſe Apocryphal Acts are expreſsly mentioned by name: there are indeed ſome other places where they are referred to, but not named, as I ſhall ſhew in the end of this chapter; and only add here ſome account of their author Leucius, and ſome reaſons for rejecting his books.

Concerning Leucius I have met with very little, beſides what has been produced above, in any writers within the limits of my time. Pacianus, a writer of the fourth century, mentions one Leucius, whom the Montaniſts falſely aſſerted to be a great promoter of their hereſy [b]; accordingly Dr. Grabe [c], and Dr. Mill [d], ſuppoſing Pacianus to ſpeak of the ſame Leucius, of whom I am now writing, conclude, *he lived in the ſecond century*, viz. ſays Dr. Mills, about the year of Chriſt 140, i. e. *a little before the riſe of the Montaniſts, who pretended to be encouraged by him.* The ſaid Doctor adds, *that Leucius was a follower of Marcion, who lived in the ſecond century, and had the ſame peculiar doctrines which are aſcribed to Lucianus, who was a companion of Marcion* [e], *and therefore that he probably was the very ſame perſon as Lucianus, who was moſt certainly a remarkable interpolator of the Canonical Goſpels, and a forger of Apocryphal Goſpels* [f].

This conjecture, I confeſs, ſhews not only much learning and ingenious criticiſm, but at firſt view ſeems very probable; but upon a ſtrict enquiry will, I believe, appear to be groundleſs: For,

[a] In Decret.
[b] Epiſt. 1. ad Sympron. in init.
[c] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 78.
[d] Prolegom. in N. T. §. 334.
[e] Ibid.
[f] Vid. loc. plur. in hoc Capite citata.

1. Leucius,

1. Leucius, of whom I am writing, the author of theſe Apocryphal Acts now under conſideration, was a Manichee; ſo he is expreſsly called by St. Auſtin and Pope Gelaſius, *and his ſpurious writings contained the peculiar favourite doctrines*[a] *of the Manichees:* Now it is a matter well known, that the Manichees were not in being till the [b] time of Aurelius Probus, or Diocleſian, i. e. not till the latter end of the third century; wherefore it is evident, either that the Montaniſts were miſtaken in ſaying Leucius was a favourite of their ſect, which are indeed the words of Pacianus *(Phryges animatos ſe a Leucio mentiri)*, or elſe the Leucius there mentioned muſt be a different perſon from him of that name, of whom we are ſpeaking; or elſe, which perhaps may be the truth of the caſe, the word *animatos* means the *reviving* or *encouraging their principles*, and not, as Dr. Mill thinks, the firſt ſpreading of them. Whichever it be, it is plain, Leucius did not live before the latter end of the third, or beginning of the fourth century after Chriſt; and conſequently, that Leucius and Lucianus were really different perſons, who lived at above an hundred years diſtance from each other.

2. Whereas Dr. Mill ſays, Leucius was the follower of Marcion as well as Lucianus, and therefore probably the ſame perſon, living in the ſecond century, and for this cites Photius, Cod. cxiv. *This, I aver, is utterly falſe*, there being no ſuch thing ſaid in that place of Photius, nor the name of Marcion ſo much as mentioned there. But that learned Doctor ſeems to have been led into this miſtake for want of conſulting Photius himſelf, and by miſunderſtanding the following words of Dr. Grabe [c]. *Leucius, Marcionis ſucceſſor, Secul. II. cujus actus ſummatim perſtrinxit Photius*, Cod. cxiv. The reaſon of my mentioning this is, to give the reader a ſpecimen of Dr. Mill's negligence in citations, which is but too viſible in other parts of his famous work on the New Teſtament: As for inſtance, I remember, ſomewhere he collects a various reading from the Syriack Verſion, whereas that moſt perfectly agrees

[a] Phot. Bibl. Cod. 114.

[b] Cyril of Jeruſalem ſays, the Manichees aroſe 70 years before him, p. 141.

[c] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 78.

in that place with our preſent Greek: but the Doctor, either not underſtanding the Syriack language, or not conſulting it, made only uſe of the Latin tranſlation of the Syriack, which indeed is in that place faulty, and not only different from the Greek, but its original, viz. Syriack.

3. As to the agreement of the ſentiments of Leucius and Lucianus, which the Doctor urges to prove them to have been the ſame perſons, it is eaſily anſwered, that Leucius *adopted into his ſcheme the principles of moſt of the former hereticks*, as I have above ſhewed out of Photius, and will appear more fully hereafter; and therefore nothing can be concluded hence to prove Leucius to have been the ſame with Lucianus, or to have lived in the ſecond century.

Leucius therefore living in the fourth century, we are from the writers of that later age to take all our accounts of him; and indeed we do not find his name in any one before Auſtin, Jerome, and Philaſtrius, who all lived towards the latter end of that age. He ſeems to me to have been the father of thoſe hereticks, who are called by St. Auſtin [a] Seleuciani, from his name Seleucus (which I above proved to be the ſame name with Leucius), who were alſo called Hermiani. *They held, that the world was not made by God, but co-eternal with him; that God did not make men's ſouls, but Angels, out of fire and air; that Chriſt does not ſit at the right hand of the Father in a human body, but that he lodged his body in the ſun according to that*, Pſalm. xix. 4. He hath ſet his tabernacle in the ſun. *They deny any future reſurrection, and place it only in the daily procreation of children.* Theſe ſeem to have been the followers of this heretick, and theſe his principles, if he may be ſaid to have had any, who received thoſe of all ſects.

As to theſe Acts, publiſhed by Leucius, there needs little more to be ſaid to prove them ſpurious. They are aſſerted to be ſo by all who mention them, and rejected as monſtrous and impious forgeries: Apocryphal therefore by Prop. IV, V, and VI. I add alſo by Prop. VIII, and IX. as containing things falſe and fabulous, trifles contrary to truth; ſuch are

[a] De Hæreſ. Num. 59. T. Opp. 6.

thoſe

thoſe ſtories of Maximilla and Iphidamia, in the fragment produced out of St. Auſtin; *ſuch eſpecially is that in the ſame fragment, of God's appearing in the form of a little boy, and feigning the voice of a woman:* ſuch, laſtly, is that mentioned by Philaſtrius, *that the ſouls of men were like the ſouls of dogs and beaſts.* Thus much may be ſufficient concerning theſe Apocryphal Acts; of which I ſhould now add no more, if I did not think it would be as entertaining to my readers, as myſelf, to tranſcribe the judgment of Photius concerning them, who, though a writer of the 9th century, well deſerves regarding, not only becauſe he had read the book, but that his judgment is always valuable. After he had ſaid he peruſed theſe Acts, and that they appeared to be wrote by Leucius Charinus, he adds (Cod. cxiv.)

Ἡ δὲ φράσις εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἀνώμαλός τε καὶ παρηλλαγμένη. Καὶ συνλάξεσι γὰρ καὶ λέξεσι κέχρηται ἐνίοτε μὲν οὐκ ἠμελημένοις, καλὰ δὲ τὸ πλεῖστον ἀγοραίοις καὶ πεπατημένοις. Καὶ ὅθεν τῆς ὑμαλῆς καὶ αὐτοσχεδίου φράσεως, καὶ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἐμφύτου χάριτος, καθ' ἣν ὁ εὐαγγελικός τε καὶ ἀποστολικὸς διαμεμόρφωται λόγος, ὅθ' ἵχνος ἐμφαίνων. Γέμει δὲ καὶ μωρίας πολλῆς, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν μάχης καὶ ἐναντιώσεως. Φησὶ γὰρ ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεὸν, καὶ κακὸν, ὃν καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Μάγον ὑπηρέτην καθεσάναι, ἄλλον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν, ὃν φησιν ἀγαθὸν· καὶ φυσῶν ἅπαντα

The ſtyle of it is irregular and inconſiſtent. He uſes phraſes and words ſometimes, which are not mean, but for the moſt part ſuch as are bald and common. There is not in it the leaſt ſign of an even free ſtyle, or of that beauty that attends ſuch a natural ſtyle, in which the writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles are compoſed. It abounds with many fooliſh and ſilly contradictions. For he ſays, *that the God of the Jews, whoſe Miniſter Simon Magus was, was a bad God, and that Chriſt was a different God from him, and a good God:* And then again perverting and confounding every thing, *he calls the Father and the Son one and the ſame:* But he adds, *that*

καὶ συγχέων, καλεῖ αὐτὸν καὶ πατέρα καὶ υἱόν· λέγει δὲ, μήδ' ἐνανθρωπήσαι ἀληθῶς, ἀλλὰ δόξαι· καὶ πολλὰ πολλάκις φανῆναι τοῖς μαθηταῖς, νέον, καὶ πρεσβύτην πάλιν, καὶ πάλιν παῖδα [a], καὶ μείζονα, καὶ ἐλάττονα, καὶ μέγιστον, ὥς τε τὴν κορυφὴν διήκειν, ἔσθ' ὅτε μέχρις οὐρανοῦ. Πολλὰς δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ κενολογίας καὶ ἀτοπίας ἀναπλάττει, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν μὴ σταυρωθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἀντ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταγελᾶν διὰ τοῦτο τῶν σταυρούντων. Γάμους δὲ νομίμους ἀθετεῖ, καὶ πᾶσαν γένησιν πονηράν τε καὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ λέγει. καὶ πλάστην τῶν δαιμόνων ἄλλον ἐκληρεῖ· νεκρῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων καὶ βοῶν καὶ κτηνῶν παραλογωτάτας καὶ μειρακιώδεις τερατεύεται ἀναστάσεις. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ κατ' εἰκόνων τοῖς εἰκονομάχοις ἐν ταῖς Ἰωάννου πράξεσι δογματίζειν· καὶ ἁπλῶς αὕτη ἡ βίβλος μυ-

Christ was not really a man, but only appeared to be so, and that he appeared often in various shapes to his Disciples, sometimes as a young man, sometimes again as an old man, and sometimes as a child; sometimes larger, sometimes less; sometimes so tall, as that his head would reach up to the heavens. Besides, he has invented many idle and ridiculous stories about the cross; and *that Christ was not crucified himself, but another in his stead, for which he laughed at the crucifiers. He denies the use of lawful marriages, and makes all generation to be evil, and from the Devil. He supposes another Creator of the Devils. He held a most prodigiously absurd sort of resurrection, both of men and oxen, and all cattle.* He seems also *in the Acts of John* with the (Iconomachi) enemies of images, to dispute against the use of them [b]. In a word, that book contains ten thousand

[a] Dr. Mill supposes a fragment of these Acts extant in a manuscript in the Bodleian, Cod. Barocc. n. 180. fol. 111. For in that, Christ is said sometimes to have appeared in the form of a boy.

[b] This passage inclines me to conjecture, that these books were interpolated, seeing in the time of Leucius, the controversy about images was unknown, it not arising until the eighth century. But perhaps Photius, living in the time when this dispute was hot, might imagine more than Leucius intended. He only says, Δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ κατ' εἰκόνων, &c.

ρία

ρία παιδαριώδη καὶ ἀπίθανα καὶ κακόπλαστα καὶ ψευδῆ καὶ μωρὰ καὶ ἄλλοις μαχόμενα, καὶ ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἄθεα περίεχει. ἦν εἰπών τις πάσης αἱρέσεως πηγὴν• καὶ μητέρα, οὐκ ἂν ἀποσφαλείη τῆ εἰκότος.

childiſh, incredible, ill-deſigning, lying, fooliſh, contradictions, profane and impious ſtories; ſo that one may not unjuſtly ſay, he was the ſource and author of every hereſy.

Beſides the above-cited places of the Fathers, where theſe Acts are expreſsly mentioned, they ſeem to be referred to in that paſſage of Epiphanius above produced, Numb. XXV. where ſpeaking of the Ebionites, he ſays, *among other Apoſtles' names they counterfeited the names of Matthew, James, and alſo John*; as alſo in that of St. Auſtin in his diſpute againſt the anonymous author (whether Marcionite or Manichee, or both, is not certain) whom he calls, *the enemy of the Law and the Prophets:* In that book, againſt which he writes, he ſays, the author [a]

De Apocryphis poſuit teſtimonia, quæ ſub nominibus Apoſtolorum Andreæ Joanniſque conſcripta ſunt; quæ ſi illorum eſſent, recepta eſſent ab eccleſia, quæ ab illorum temporibus per Epiſcoporum ſucceſſiones certiſſimas, uſque ad noſtra & deinceps tempora perſeverat.

Made citations out of the Apocryphal books under the names of the Apoſtles Andrew and John; which, if they were really theirs, would have been received by the Church, which has continued under an uninterrupted ſucceſſion of Biſhops, from their time to ours, &c.

There can ſcarce be any reaſon to doubt, but theſe were the ſame Acts which were compoſed by Leucius, if we conſider what is above ſaid, as alſo that they are the ſame mentioned in the Decree of Pope Innocent I. [b]

[a] Contr. Adverſ. Leg. & Proph. lib. 1. cap. 20. T. Opp. 6.

[b] Epiſt. ad Exuper. 3. c. 7.

Cætera

Cætera autem, quæ ſub nomine Petri & Joannis, quæ a quodam Leucio ſcripta ſunt, vel ſub nomine Andreæ, quæ a Nexocharide & Leonide philoſophis; non ſolum repudianda, verum etiam noveris eſſe damnanda.

But the other books under the name of Peter and John, which were written by one Leucius, or under the name of Andrew, which were written by Nexocharides and Leonides philoſophers; know, that they are not only to be rejected, but condemned.

I confeſs, in this Decree the books of Andrew, and thoſe of Peter and John, are made different, as wrote by different authors, viz. the latter by Leucius, and the former by Leonides and Nexocharides: but nothing is more probable than the conjecture of Mr. Fabritius, *that Innocent was miſtaken in theſe names, and that they were no other than the name of Leucius Charinus corruptly written.* It ſeems to me to be accounted for, by conſidering the contracted way of writing formerly, which has produced an infinite variety of ſuch miſtakes by ignorant and careleſs ſcribes, eſpecially in proper names: for the name Leucius being contractedly written thus *L.* or *Lũs.* by one ſcribe, might by another ſcribe be read, and accordingly written in his copy, Leonides, by the eaſy miſtake of the letter *u* for the letter *n*, which are much alike in many writings. This we are ſure was the caſe, in reſpect of the name Leontius, which was another name for Leucius in ſome copies, as I have above obſerved. As to the name Nexocharis, or, which is the better reading, Xenocharis, I am inclined to think, that it was by ſome blundering ſcribe formed from, or written for, Charinus, the ſurname of Leucius, in the following manner. Before the name Charinus, contractedly written in ſome Greek book thus χῆς, happened to be the appellative word ξένος (perhaps to denote his ſtrange doctrines, it being commonly uſed by the Fathers in that ſenſe) or ξένες; now an ignorant ſcribe, not knowing the true name of the perſon there ſpoken of, might very probably join the words ξένος and χῆς together, and ſo form the name Ξενόχαρις Xenocharis, which

muſt

muſt afterwards be received as a true name. This ſeems to me the more probable, becauſe,

1. I do not remember ever, beſides here, to have ſeen this name.

2. Becauſe it is certain, that in the antient way of writing (as is evident by manuſcripts extant) *there was no diſtinction or ſpace between one word and another*, but the whole line was written as one continued word.

3. *The word* ξένος *was very commonly prefixed to men's names*; hence we read of ſeveral called Xenophon, as thoſe two who were the famous diſciples of Socrates at Athens; Xenocrates, a philoſopher of Chalcedonia, and two more remarkable philoſophers of that name; ſo alſo Xenodochus, Xenodorus, Xenodotus, Xenophanes, Xenophates, Xenophilus, &c. vid. Suid. The word ξένος being ſo frequently prefixed, the miſtake was ſo much the more eaſy.

4. Such miſtakes are very common, eſpecially in the proper names of perſons and places.

CHAP. XXII.

The falſe Goſpels of Lucianus, a famous Critick and Martyr under Diocleſian; who publiſhed an Edition of the Septuagint: a different Perſon from Lucanus, the Diſciple of Marcion. A Correction of a Place in Epiphanius. The Commentaries under the Name of Origen, upon Job, proved not to belong to that Father.

Numb. XXXIV. The falſe GOSPELS of LUCIANUS.

TO theſe I have, for method ſake, given a diſtinct title, though *they appear to have been only ſome corrupted interpolated copies of our preſent Goſpels.* They are only mentioned by Jerome and Gelaſius together with the falſe Goſpels of Heſychius. The places are produced above, Chap. XIX.

Numb.

Numb. XXIII. to which, and what is there ſaid, there ſeems nothing neceſſary here to be added, but ſome ſhort account of Lucianus, their author. He was undoubtedly that eminent critick, whoſe labours in correcting the corrupt copies of the Septuagint Verſion have made him famous. He was a preſbyter of Antioch, and ſuffered martyrdom under Diocleſian and Maximian, viz. about the year of Chriſt 296. He was ſo remarkable in his ſtudy of the Scriptures, that the copies were called by his name; and his edition of the LXX. was the only one received in all the Eaſtern part of the world, except that which Heſychius publiſhed in Egypt, and Euſebius and Pamphilus publiſhed from Origen [a]. That this was the ſame Lucianus with him who interpolated the Goſpels, is evident from the expreſs teſtimony of Jerome [b], who ſays *the ſame Heſychius and Lucianus were employed in altering the LXX. Verſion, and the Copies of the New Teſtament.* Hence it is plain, that Dr. Mill [c] is egregiouſly miſtaken, in ſuppoſing *this Lucianus to have been the ſame perſon as Marcion's diſciple and follower, mentioned by Tertullian* [d], *and called Lucanus:* for as it is certain, that Marcion, and conſequently Lucanus, lived early in the ſecond century; ſo from what has been ſaid, it is no leſs certain that Lucianus ſuffered martyrdom in the very end of the third. It may not therefore be improper here to obſerve, that the hereticks called by Epiphanius [e] the Lucianiſts, and placed between Marcion and Apelles, called ſo from Lucian who was the diſciple of Marcion, and fellow-pupil of Apelles, were either falſely ſo called by Epiphanius, or elſe our printed copies of that author are corrupt, and we ought to read Λουκανιστοὶ inſtead of Λουκιανιστοὶ, i. e. Lucaniſts inſtead of Lucianiſts, as proceeding from Lucanus, as he is called by Tertullian in the place juſt now cited, and alſo by Origen in his book againſt Celſus [f], though in the old Latin tranſlation we meet with Lucianus, contrary to the Greek. I have no-

[a] This account I collected from Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 9. c. 6. Jerome Catal. vir. illuſtr. in Lucian. & Præfat. in Paralipom. & Suidas in Lucian.

[b] Præfat. in Evang. ad Damas.

[c] Prolegom. in N. T. §. 333.

[d] De Præſcript. adv. Hæretic. c. 51.

[e] Hæreſ. 43, 44.

[f] Lib. 2. p. 77.

thing

thing more to add here, but that by accident I obſerved a paſſage in the *Commentary under the name of Origen, upon the book of Job*, where mention is made of Lucianus, with a very glorious character [a]; but inaſmuch as it is moſt undeniable that Origen died long before the time of Lucianus, viz. in the year of Chriſt 253, under the Emperors Gallus and Voluſianus [b], there is no queſtion to be made, but thoſe books upon Job were wrote by ſome perſon long after Origen's time.

CHAP. XXIII.

Books under the Name of Matthew. The Goſpel of Matthias. The Traditions of Matthias. All its Fragments produced. There never was any Book under this Title. The Sentiments of late Writers concerning theſe Traditions. Some Books aſcribed to Matthias. The Acts of the Manichees.

M.

Numb. XXXV. BOOKS under the Name of ST. MATTHEW.

EPIPHANIUS, concerning the Ebionites, ſays, they forged ſeveral books under the Apoſtles' names, and particularly under St. Matthew's. The paſſage is produced above, Chap. XX. Numb. XXV. There being nothing more ſaid by Epiphanius of theſe books, nor indeed by him or any other author, of any ſpurious books under this Apoſtle's name, beſides *the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, I have no more to ſay concerning theſe books, than that, as they are rejected by this Father as ſpurious, ſo for that reaſon they are Apocryphal, as alſo by Prop. IV, V, VI, and perhaps what he here means was *no other than the Hebrew Goſpel of the Ebionites, or Nazarenes.*

[a] Opp. Lat. T. 2. fol. 27. [b] Catal. vir. illuſtr. in Origen.

Numb.

Numb. XXXVI. The GOSPEL of MATTHIAS.

ALTHOUGH there be not any remains of this Goſpel now extant, yet it is taken notice of by ſeveral of the moſt celebrated writers among the antients, viz. Origen, Euſebius, Ambroſe and Jerome, as alſo in ſome copies of Pope Gelaſius's Decree.

Origen mentions it among many other ſpurious pieces thus [a];

Eccleſia quatuor habet Evangelia, hæreſes plurima. Scio Evangelium quod appellatur ——juxta Matthiam, &c.	The Church receives only four Goſpels, the hereticks many. I know one, which is called *the Goſpel according to Matthias*. [See the paſſage at large above, Chap. VII. Numb. V.]

Euſebius ranks it among the books *publiſhed by the hereticks, not received nor cited by any Eccleſiaſtical writer, but a mere forgery, to be rejected as impious and abſurd.* [See the place produced at large above, Chap. XXI. Numb. XXXIII.]

Ambroſe in like manner places it *among thoſe ſpurious books which the Church rejected as ſuch.* [See the paſſage at large above, Chap. VII. Numb. V.]

Jerome places it among the books *which gave birth to the hereſies which troubled the Church, and which were wrote without the ſpirit and grace of God.* [See the place above produced, Chap. VII. Numb. IV.]

Laſtly, in ſome copies of the Decree of Pope Gelaſius, we read

Evangelium nomine Matthiæ Apocryphum.	The Goſpel under the name of Matthias is Apocryphal.

[a] Homil. in Luc. i. in init.

From

From all this it is eaſy to ſee, what judgment we are to form of this book, and to conclude it Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI. The learned Dr. Grabe[a], and after him Dr. Mill[b], ſuppoſe this Goſpel to have been the ſame with the traditions of Matthias, but with very little reaſon, as I ſhall ſhew preſently in diſcuſſing that book.

Numb. XXXVII. The TRADITIONS of MATTHIAS.

THESE are only mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus, in whoſe *Stromata* there are ſome fragments of them remaining, which the hereticks made uſe of. They are collected by Dr. Grabe, and ſhall be here produced, with the addition of two or three more places, where theſe traditions are referred to.

The firſt is as follows[c].

Καὶ Ματθίας ἐν ταῖς παραδόσεσι παραινῶν, Θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα, βαθμὸν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως ὑποτιθέμενος.

So Matthias adviſes *in his Traditions*, (ſaying) *Admire the things that are preſent*, making this to be the firſt ſtep towards increaſe of knowledge.

The ſecond is[d];

Λέγεσι (Νικόλαΐται) γ' ἔν καὶ τὸν Ματθίαν ἄτως διδάξαι, σαρκὶ μὲν μάχεσθαι καὶ παραχρῆσθαι, μηδὲν αὐτῇ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἀκόλαστον ἐνδιδόντα, ψυχὴν δὲ αὔξειν διὰ πίστεως καὶ γνώσεως.

The Nicolaitans accordingly ſay, that Matthias taught the following doctrine, viz. *That we are to oppoſe the fleſh, and ſo to uſe it, as not to gratify it in any exceſſive pleaſures, but to enlarge the ſoul with faith and knowledge.*

[a] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. 2. p. 117.
[b] Prolegom. in N. T. §. 337.
[c] Lib. 2. p. 380.
[d] Lib. 3. p. 436.

The

The third is [a];

Ζακχαῖον τοίνυν, οἱ δὲ Ματθίαν φασὶν, ἀρχιτελώνην, ἀκηκοότα τὸ Κυρίε καταξιώσαντος πρὸς αὐτὸν γενέσθαι, Ἰδὲ τὰ ἡμίσεα τῶν ὑπαρχόντων μου δίδωμι ἐλεημοσύνην, φάναι, Κύριε, καὶ εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα, τετραπλᾶν ἀποδίδωμι.

Therefore when Zaccheus, others say it was Matthias, a chief publican, heard our Lord say, *That he was worthy for him to abide with*, he said, *Behold I give half of my goods to the poor, and if I have wronged any one, I restore to him four-fold.*

The fourth is [b];

Λέγουσι δὲ ἐν ταῖς παραδόσεσι Ματθίαν τὸν Ἀπόστολον παρ' ἕκαστα εἰρηκέναι, ὅτι ἐὰν ἐκλεκτῷ γείτων ἁμαρτήσῃ, ἥμαρτεν ὁ ἐκλεκτός· εἰ γὰρ ἔτως ἑαυτὸν ἦγεν, ὡς ὁ λόγος ὑπαγορεύει, κατηδέσθη ἂν αὐτῷ τὸν βίον καὶ ὁ γείτων, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἁμαρτεῖν.

But they say *among the Traditions*, that Matthias the Apostle among other things said, *That if the neighbour of a believer fall into sin, the believer himself is guilty of it; for if his conduct had been agreeable to reason*, (or the word) *his neighbour would have regarded his life so much, as not to have fallen into the sin.*

The last is [c];

Τῶν δ' αἱρέσεων αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ ὀνόματος προσαγορεύονται, ὡς ἡ ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνε, καὶ Μαρκιώνος, καὶ Βασιλείδε, κἂν τὴν Ματθίε αὐχῶσι προσάγεσθαι δόξαν. μία γὰρ ἡ πάντων γέγονε τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὥσπερ διδασκαλία, ἔτως δὲ καὶ ἡ παράδοσις.

Of the heresies some are called by the name of their author, as that of Valentinus, and Marcion, and Basilides, though indeed they boast of *the opinions of Matthias*, viz. as favouring theirs. But as there was but one doctrine delivered by the Apostles, so there can be but one (true) Tradition.

[a] Lib. 4. p. 488.
[b] Strom. lib. 7. p. 748.
[c] Eodem Lib. p. 765.

These

Theſe are all the accounts we have of theſe Traditions of Matthias, concerning which I will endeavour to prove two things, viz.

I. *That they were not really any book, or written collection, but only ſome oral Traditions.*

II. *That if there was any ſuch book, entitled* the Traditions of Matthias, *it was certainly Apocryphal.*

I. *That theſe Traditions of Matthias were not really any book, or written collection, but mere oral Traditions.* To evince this, I obſerve,

1. That, beſides Clemens Alexandrinus in the places cited, *no writer of the four firſt centuries, nor indeed any other antient writer, has ſo much as mentioned the name of theſe Traditions of Matthias.* This one can ſcarcely imagine, if ever ſuch a book were really extant; for then it could not but have been frequently appealed to by the Valentinians, Marcionites, and Baſilides; and conſequently muſt have been mentioned by Irenæus, Tertullian, or Epiphanius, in their diſputes againſt thoſe hereticks.

2. *This ſeems clearly deducible from the paſſages themſelves* in Clemens Alexandrinus; in no one of which he uſes either the word βίβλος, γέγραπται, or any word of that ſort, which will imply any thing to have been written; but, on the other hand, in each of theſe places introduces his account with a plain intimation, that he looked upon them only as oral traditions. So page 748, Λέγουσι δὲ ἐν ταῖς παραδόσεσι, i. e. *They ſay among the Traditions*, i. e. It is a common Tradition, or commonly ſaid, *that Matthias taught*, &c. And for this conſtruction I have the countenance of the Latin tranſlator, who renders Clemens thus, *Dicunt autem in Traditionibus*, inſerting a comma after the word *Traditionibus*, to evidence that Clemens did not there ſpeak of any written book. So likewiſe in that place, page 436, Λέγουσι γ' οὖν κ᾽ τὸν Ματθίαν οὕτως διδάξαι, &c. *They, i. e. the Nicolaitans, ſay, that Matthias taught ſo*, &c. Where, as there is no mention of any written book of Mat-

thias, ſo there is a plain intimation, that this ſaying attributed to him by the Nicolaitans was a current Tradition among them, as from him, in order to ſupport their abominable doctrine of the communion of women. Once more page 765, where he ſays, ſeveral hereticks, τὴν Ματθίᾳ αὐχῶσι δόξαν, *boaſted of the opinions of Matthias*, as being agreeable to theirs, he manifeſtly ſhews, they were only ſome traditionary and ſpurious opinions of that Apoſtle; for elſe I know not how to underſtand that oppoſition he makes between Διδασκαλία and παράδοσις; the words are μία ἡ πάντων γέγονε τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὥσπερ διδασκαλία, οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡ παράδοσις, i. e. *The doctrine of the Apoſtles in their writings cannot be different from, or contrary to, any traditionary doctrines pretending to be theirs*; in which there is implied a good argument againſt thoſe hereticks; viz. That their principles muſt be erroneous, becauſe they were only ſupported by ſome traditionary doctrines, which, being contrary to thoſe which were written, muſt of neceſſity be falſe, unleſs the Apoſtles can be ſuppoſed to have preached one thing, and wrote another quite contrary.

3. It is a thing very notorious in Chriſtian antiquity, that the hereticks, not being able to maintain their perverſe tenets by the written Scriptures, nor to anſwer the arguments brought againſt them from them, *continually applied* not only to Apocryphal forgeries, but *unwritten Traditions*. By this means the unhappy Jews were deluded into the moſt fatal errors [a]: thus the Chriſtians were deceived into a belief of the neceſſity of Judaiſm, as we read in the Synodical Epiſtle from Jeruſalem [b]: thus the doctrine of the Millennium firſt gained its reputation from the credulous Papias, who was ſo fond of Tradition [c]: thus, in a word, a thouſand ridiculous fables have received credit in the Church, and even ſtill are made uſe of in the *Church of Rome* to maintain the abſurdeſt doctrines of it, as may be ſeen in almoſt every writer againſt Popery. From all which, with what is ſaid above, it appears more probable, that theſe were ſome unwritten Traditions, than any written book of Matthias.

[a] Mar. vii. 7. [b] Act. xv. 24. [c] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.

To

To this opinion I know nothing that can, with any reaſon, be objected; though I am ſenſible, theſe Traditions have hitherto been always eſteemed as a written book by thoſe who have taken any notice of it, as Sixtus Senenſis [a], Dr. Grabe [b], Mr. Toland [c], Mr. Fabritius [d], Dr. Mill [e], and Mr. Whiſton [f], &c. But I hope what I have urged is ſufficient to prove the miſtake. Dr. Grabe, Dr. Mill, and Mr. Whiſton, have propoſed their conjectures concerning it, which I ſhall here briefly examine.

Dr. Grabe [g] ſuppoſes it to have been the ſame book with that I laſt treated of, intitled, *The Goſpel of Matthias*. His words are,

Inter Evangelia mala hæreticorum fide nominibus Apoſtolorum ſuppoſita, Matthiæ quoque adſcriptum aliquod memorat Euſebius Lib. III. Hiſt. Eccl. c. 25. Quod idem puto eſſe cum παραδόσεσι *Traditionibus* a Clemente Alexandrino memoratis; quia Evangelia ſcribebantur, Καθὼς παρέδοσαν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.

Among the falſe Goſpels impiouſly forged under the Apoſtles names by the hereticks, Euſebius mentions *one aſcribed to Matthias; which I ſuppoſe to be the ſame with the* παραδόσεις, *i. e. Traditions mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus*; becauſe the Goſpels were written as they delivered, who were from the beginning eye-witneſſes, and miniſters of the word.

There is nothing can be more weak than this argument, being only founded upon a word, which may be uſed in a very large ſenſe. It needs no other confutation than putting it in its proper light: it ſtands thus; the accounts of our Saviour's life were compoſed out of the Traditions of thoſe who ſaw his actions; therefore the Traditions of Matthias were an account of our Saviour's life, or a Goſpel; i. e. Chriſt's life was

[a] Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. p. 83. ad voc. Matthias.
[b] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. II. p. 117.
[c] Amyntor p. 30.
[d] Cod. Apocr. N. Teſtam. t. 2. p. 784, &c.
[e] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 53, & 337.
[f] Eſſay on Conſtitut. p. 37.
[g] Loc. cit.

wrote by Tradition, therefore there were no other Traditions. This is *ludere cum vocibus*. But beſides, as Mr. Fabritius well obſerves[a], the contents of theſe Traditions were not like the contents of a Goſpel, which are always ſome ſayings or hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt, but the fragments of theſe Traditions are of another ſort, as is evident by the moſt curſory view of them.

Dr. Mill[b] follows Dr. Grabe, and ſuppoſes farther, that it was one of theſe books, which St. Luke had reſpect to in the preface of his Goſpel, compoſed and publiſhed in the following manner.

Mihi ſane videntur παραδόσεις iſtæ ex ore Matthiæ in Judæa prædicantis initio exceptæ fuiſſe a Chriſtiano quopiam, & in libellum redactæ; cui ad majorem traditionibus iſtis conciliandam auctoritatem Apoſtoli nomen præfixit auctor, quiſquis ille fuerit. Cæterum cum libro iſti, perinde ac cæteris διηγήσεσιν inſerta eſſent, ex errore διηγητῶ, quædam haud ἀσφαλῆ, quædam item doctrinæ Chriſtianæ minus conſona, quibus, incaute animoque non malo ſcriptis, abuſi eſſent Baſilidiani, Valentiniani, aliique hæretici, ad ſuos errores ſtabiliendos; hinc poſt editionem Canonicorum Evangeliorum in deſuetudinem abiit, atque etiam inter libros hæreticos numeratus eſt.

It ſeems to me, that *theſe Traditions of Matthias were taken from his mouth, when he firſt preached in Judæa, by ſome Chriſtians, and formed into a little book; to procure the greater reſpect to which Traditions, the author, whoever he was, prefixed the name of the Apoſtle.* But as in that, as well as other accounts, viz. of Chriſt, through the miſtake of the author, ſeveral things were inſerted, neither ſound, nor agreeable to the Chriſtian doctrine, which though unguardedly wrote, and without any ill intent, the Baſilidians, Valentinians, and other hereticks, made a wrong uſe of, to eſtabliſh their errors. It became diſuſed after the publiſhing of the Canonical Goſpels, and was reckoned among the heretical books.

[a] Lib. cit. p. 784. [b] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſt. §. 53.

The

The ſame learned Dr. in another place [a] imagines *this book of Traditions to have been interpolated by Leucius*, and to have *received the addition of many trifling and falſe ſtories from his hand.* But as his opinion about the original of the book is not only propoſed without any attempt to make it ſo much as probable, but appears, by what has been above ſaid, to be falſe and groundleſs, ſo alſo is his account of the interpolations of it, as I ſhall ſhew Numb. XXXVIII.

Mr. Whiſton [b], diſcourſing about Philo's Therapeutæ, whom he takes for Chriſtians in Egypt before the coming of St. Mark, ſuppoſes not only the *Goſpel of the Egyptians*, but alſo the *Traditions of Matthias*, to have been in uſe among them: but of this conjecture he has aſſigned no reaſon; and therefore I think it ſufficient to my deſign only to inform the reader of it.

What farther remains now is;

II. To ſhew, that if theſe Traditions were really a book, *they were Apocryphal*, which is manifeſt by Prop. IV, V, and VI. but eſpecially by Prop. VIII. as it contained the principles of the moſt impious hereticks, viz. the Nicolaitans, Carpocratians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Baſilidians. &c.

Numb. XXXVIII. BOOKS under the NAME of MATTHIAS.

IN the before-cited Decree of Pope Innocent I. according to one edition, we read [c];

Cætera quæ ſub nomine Matthiæ, ſive Jacobi Minoris—quæ a quodam Leucio ſcripta ſunt—non ſolum repudianda, verum noveris eſſe damnanda.

Other books, ſuch as that *under the name of Matthias*, or *James the Leſs* — which were written by one Leucius—— know, that they are not only to be rejected, but condemned.

[a] Ibid. §. 337.
[b] Eſſay on Conſtitut. p. 37.
[c] Epiſt. 3. ad Exuper. c. 7.

Dr. Mill [a], as I juſt now ſaid, concludes from theſe words of Innocent, that *theſe were the Goſpel or Traditions of Matthias*, quas falſis abſurdiſque narratiunculis paſſim interſperſit hic ipſe impoſtor Leucius, *in which the impoſtor Leucius ſcattered up and down ſeveral falſe and abſurd ſtories; on the account of which Origen, Euſebius, and Jerome rejected it.* But in this the Doctor is alſo much miſtaken; for Leucius, as has been proved, did not live till the latter end of the third century [b], and conſequently Origen could not reject any book on account of his interpolations. Beſides, the words of Innocent are, that *Leucius wrote a book under the name of Matthias*, and not that he interpolated one already written: from all which it is evident, he ſpeaks of ſome book diſtinct from the Goſpel of Matthias, which Origen rejected, and ſo from the Traditions alſo, which, according to the Doctor, was the ſame book with the Goſpel. If I were to conjecture concerning the books under the name of Matthias here mentioned, I ſhould ſay, it ſeems probable, *they were ſome Acts wrote by Leucius, under that Apoſtle's name*, for theſe two reaſons, viz.

1. Becauſe *Leucius wrote the Acts of many other Apoſtles*, as may be above ſeen, Chap. XXI. towards the beginning.

2. Becauſe *in ſome copies of the Decrees of Pope Gelaſius we find mention of the* Apocryphal Acts under the name of Matthias.

Whatever the book was, it was certainly ſpurious and Apocryphal (as Innocent determines) by Prop. IV, V, and VI.

Numb. XXXIX. The ACTS of the APOSTLES made uſe of by the MANICHEES.

SEE concerning this in the Acts of Leucius Charinus above Chap. XXI. where I have made it evident, theſe were the ſame with thoſe ſpurious Acts compoſed by that notorious impoſtor.

[a] Loc. denuo cit. [b] C. 21.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

The Goſpel of Martion no other than a Copy of St. Luke's Goſpel altered and interpolated by that Heretick. The Goſpel of Merinthus the ſame with the Goſpel of Cerinthus.

Numb. XL. The GOSPEL of MARCION.

IT would not be agreeable to that impartiality, which I would willingly evidence in the whole of this work, if I ſhould omit the diſcuſſing any one book, which has been pretended to be ſacred, and received as ſuch in the firſt centuries after Chriſt. Such the Goſpel of Marcion was, *though really no other than one of our preſent Goſpels, wretchedly corrupted and altered by that ſilly heretick.* We meet with very frequent mention of this work; I ſhall only produce the places where it is called the Goſpel of Marcion, and of theſe I find only two; one of Tertullian, the other of Epiphanius.

Tertullian mentions it thus [a].

Contra Marcion, Evangelio ſcilicet ſuo, nullum adſcribit auctorem, quaſi non licuerit illi titulum quoque affingere, cui nefas non fuit ipſum corpus evertere.	On the contrary Marcion prefixes no author's name *to his Goſpel*, as if he might not as juſtly have forged a title, as have corrupted the whole body of the book.

A little farther: [b]

Ego meum dico verum, Marcion ſuum: Ego Marcionis affirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum.	I ſay my (Goſpel) is true; Marcion ſays, that *his* is ſo: I affirm, Marcion's is corrupted; he ſays that mine is.

Epiphanius [c] calls it more than once Εὐαγγέλιον τὸ παρὰ Μαρκίωνος, *The Goſpel of Marcion.*

[a] Adverſ. Marcion. l. 4. c. 2.
[b] Lib. cit. c. 4.
[c] Hæreſ. 42. in Procem.

Now for the better underſtanding of this, we muſt obſerve, that Marcion is no where ſaid to have compoſed any new Goſpel, but only to have altered and changed ſome other. That which he changed and corrupted was *the Goſpel of St. Luke.* Of this we have very large accounts from the antients, eſpecially Irenæus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius. *He took away entirely the two firſt chapters of Luke*, and many other parts, as alſo inſerted a great many things of his own, all which was deſigned for the propagating his ſilly principles. But this matter belonging rather to the hiſtory of the Text than the Canon, I ſhall here wave it; only obſerve, that Epiphanius hath largely collected the alterations and interpolations which Marcion made; concerning whom and this work of his he may be ſufficiently informed, who will conſult the ſeveral authors referred to in the margin [a]. I ſhall only obſerve farther, that any thing that can be ſaid in favour of Marcion's copies of St. Luke above our preſent copies, as far as they affect the Canonical authority of that Goſpel, ſhall be carefully diſcuſſed in its proper place, in the laſt part of this work.

Numb. XLI. The GOSPEL of MERINTHUS.

THIS is mentioned only by Epiphanius, as one of thoſe ſpurious Goſpels, which he ſuppoſes were written in the Apoſtles' time, and referred to by St. Luke, chap. i. 1. *as not being a true and genuine account* [b]. His words are,

Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν· ἵνα τινὰς μὲν ἐπιχειρητὰς δείξῃ. φημὶ δὲ τὸν περὶ Κήρινθον, καὶ Μήρινθον, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας.

St. Luke, in the beginning of his Goſpel by theſe words, *foraſmuch as many have taken in hand, &c.* does intimate, there had been many undertakers; among which I ſay were Cerinthus, and Merinthus, and others.

[a] Iren. adv. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 11, 12. Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib. 4. c. 4. &c. Epiphan. Hæreſ. 42. Father Simon. Crit. Hiſt. of the New Teſt. par. 1. c. 12. Du Pin Hiſtory of the Canon, vol. 2. ch. 2. §. 5. Dr. Mill's Prolegom. in Nov. Teſt. §. 306, 328.

[b] Hæreſ. 51. §. 7.

I think

I think there is very little reaſon to queſtion, but this Merinthus was the very ſame perſon with Cerinthus, of whom and whoſe Goſpel I have above ſpoken, Chap. XII. Numb. X. for though Epiphanius ſeems in this place, and in a few lines before it, to make them two different perſons, yet in the hereſy of the Cerinthians [a] he profeſſes himſelf uncertain, *whether they were not really the ſame perſon. The Cerinthians*, ſays he, *are called alſo Merinthians, as we ſee by the accounts we now have; but whether this Cerinthus was alſo called Merinthus, we cannot certainly determine; or whether there was ſome other perſon called Merinthus, a fellow-labourer of his, God knows.* Mr. Fabritius ſuppoſes they were the ſame, and that the name Cerinthus was changed into Merinthus by way of banter or reproach, the word ſignifying a ſnare. And of ſuch changes he gives ſeveral inſtances, as Eudoxius called Adoxius, Photius and Photinus called Scotinus, Vigilantius called Dormitantius, Fauſtus Socinus called Infauſtus, &c. But I think it much more probable that this diverſity of name aroſe rather from the fault of ſome ſcribe, who read in his copy Μήρινθος for Κήρινθος, i. e. an M. for a C. which letters in the old way of writing Greek were not ſo much unlike, but that a ſcribe may be ſuppoſed to miſtake them.

I need not therefore ſay any thing more concerning this book, than what is ſaid above, Chap. XII.

[a] Hæreſ. 28. §. 8.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

The Gospel of the Nazarenes or Hebrews; the most famous of all the antient Gospels: Referred to by St. Paul, and many of the primitive Writers of Christianity. All the Places where it is mentioned, and all the remaining Fragments of it produced at large. Several Histories concerning Christ, and Sayings of Christ, among these Fragments.

N.

Numb. XLII. The GOSPEL according to the NAZARENES or HEBREWS.

OF all the various books of the catalogue in the first part, there is none which has been so much treated of, either by the antients or moderns, as this has. Many have wrote concerning it; and many not only of the Romish, but Protestant writers, have exalted it to a degree of authority very near equal, I had almost said superior to some, or even any, of the Canonical books of the New Testament, now received. The discussing this, therefore, is not only of the greatest necessity, but requires the greatest diligence and exactness. I shall attempt it with all the brevity and clearness I can, in the following method.

I. I shall produce all that is said of it by, and all that remains of it in, any writer of the four first centuries.

II. I will give as succinct account as I can of the opinions of later writers concerning it.

III. Prove that it was not received by any primitive writers of the Church, as Canonical.

IV. That it was really a spurious impious forgery, and so Apocryphal.

V. Give some account of its nature, design, and authors.

N. B. First, I have above proved the Gospel *according to the Twelve Apostles*, the Gospel of Bartholomew, and that

that of Cerinthus, to be the ſame with the Goſpel of the Nazarenes; and therefore ſhall not need here to produce the teſtimonies of the antients concerning them, but muſt deſire the reader to look back on Chap. VII. Numb. V. Chap. X. Numb. VIII. and Chap. XII. Numb. X.

N. B. Secondly, the Goſpel of the Ebionites, and that according to the Hebrews, appear ſo evidently to have been in the greateſt part the ſame with this Nazarene Goſpel, that as I have omitted ſaying any thing of them in their proper places, in the Alphabet, ſo I ſhall here produce what is ſaid concerning them, promiſcuouſly with that which is ſaid of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes.

This premiſed, according to my method, I ſhall

I. Endeavour to *produce all that is ſaid of it by, and all that remains of it in, any writer of the four firſt centuries.*

1. St. Paul, Gal. i. 6.

Θαυμάζω ὅτι ἕτω ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριςῦ, εἰς ἕτερον Εὐαγγέλιον. ὃ ὐκ ἔςιν ἄλλο· εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς, καὶ θέλοντες μεταςρέψαι τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τῦ Χριςῦ. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς, ἢ Ἄγγελος ἐξ ὐρανῦ, εὐαγγελίζηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔςω.

I marvel that ye are ſo ſoon removed from him, that called you into the Grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel: which is not another; but there be ſome that trouble you, and would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt. But though we, or an Angel from heaven, preach any other Goſpel unto you, than that we preached unto you, let him be accurſed.

I have above [a] attempted to prove, that St. Paul in theſe words had reference to the *Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, and by a farther acquaintance with theſe Nazarenes and their Goſpel, am abundantly confirmed in that conjecture; as, I perſuade

[a] Part 1. chap. 2.

myſelf,

myſelf, every impartial reader will alſo be, that ſhall compare it with the following accounts.

2. By Hegeſippus [a], or rather Euſebius, ſpeaking concerning Hegeſippus.

Ἐκ τε τῶ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τῇ Συριακῇ, καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος διαλέκτου, τινὰ τίθησιν, ἐμφαίνων ἐξ Ἑβραίων ἑαυτὸν πεπιστευκέναι.

He has alſo wrote (laid down) ſome things concerning the *Goſpel according to the Hebrews*, and *Syrians*, as alſo concerning the Hebrew language, by which he evidences that he was converted from Judaiſm to Chriſtianity.

3. By Clemens Alexandrinus [b].

Καὶ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγελίῳ, ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει, γέγραπται, καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαυθήσεται.

And it is written *in the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, he who admires ſhall reign, and he who reigns ſhall be at eaſe.*

4. By Origen [c].

Ἐὰν δὲ προσίεταί τις τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν, Ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου, καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ, &c.

But if any one will receive the Goſpel *according to the Hebrews*, in which our Saviour ſays, *The Holy Ghoſt my mother lately took me by one of my hairs, and led me to the great mountain Thabor, &c.*

5. By the ſame [d].

Age, aliter tractemus hunc locum.—— Scriptum eſt in Evangelio

But let us treat this place a little otherwiſe:—It is writ-

[a] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 22.
[b] Stromat. lib. 2. p. 380.
[c] Tom. 2. Comment. in Joan. p. 58.
[d] Hom. 8. in Matt. tom. 3. p. 21. Opp. Lat.

Evangelio quodam, quod dicitur ſecundum Hebræos (ſi tamen placet alicui ſuſcipere illud, non ad auctoritatem, ſed ad manifeſtationem propoſitæ quæſtionis); Dixit, inquit, ad eum alter divitum, Magiſter, quid bonum faciens vivam? Dixit ei, Homo, legem & prophetas fac: reſpondit ad eum, Feci; dixit ei, Vade, vende omnia quæ poſſides, & divide pauperibus, & veni, ſequere me. Cœpit autem dives ſcalpere caput ſuum, & non placuit ei; & dixit ad eum Dominus, Quomodo dicis, legem feci & prophetas? quoniam ſcriptum eſt in lege, Diliges proximum tuum ſicut teipſum; & ecce multi fratres filii Abrahæ amicti ſunt ſtercore, morientes præ fame, & domus tua plena eſt multis bonis, & non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ea ad eos. Et converſus, dixit Simoni diſcipulo ſuo, ſedenti apud ſe, Simon, fili Joannæ, facilius eſt camelum intrare per foramen acus, quam divitem in regnum cœlorum.

ten in a certain Goſpel, which is intitled *according to the Hebrews*, (if any one be pleaſed to receive it, not as of any authority, but only for illuſtration of the preſent queſtion); *A certain rich man* (ſays that Goſpel) *ſaid to Chriſt, Maſter, what good thing ſhall I do, that I may inherit life? He ſaid to him, O man, keep the Law and the Prophets: he anſwered him, That I have done; he ſaid to him, Go, ſell all things that thou haſt, and diſtribute among the poor, and come and follow me. The rich man hereupon began to ſcratch his head, and was diſpleaſed; and the Lord ſaid to him, How can you ſay that you have kept the Law and the Prophets? ſeeing it is written in the Law,* Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf; *but behold, many of thy brethren, children of Abraham, are clothed with naſtineſs, and ready to periſh for hunger, while thy houſe abounds with all ſorts of delicacies, and nothing is ſent out of it to them. And turning about, he ſaid to his Diſciple Simon, who ſat by him,* Simon, ſon of Joanna, it is eaſier for a camel to paſs through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man, &c.

I have

I have not obſerved any other places beſides theſe two, in Origen's works, where this Goſpel is mentioned, though the former paſſage is indeed cited elſewhere [a]; and Jerome ſays, Origen cited this Goſpel often [b]: but in this either he was miſtaken, or he means in ſome other books of Origen's not now extant.

6. By Euſebius [c].

Enumerating many of thoſe Apocryphal books which he calls νόθους, i. e. ſpurious, or forgeries, he adds,

Ἤδη δ' ἐν τούτοις τινὲς καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν, ᾧ μάλιστα Ἑβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι χαίρουσι.

In this number ſome have placed *the Goſpel according to the Hebrews*, with which they of the Jews, who profeſs Chriſtianity, are very much delighted.

7. By the ſame [d], ſpeaking of the Ebionites.

Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους λεγομένῳ χρώμενοι, τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρὸν ἐποιοῦντο λόγον.

They made uſe only of that which is called, *The Goſpel according to the Hebrews*, very little eſteeming any others.

8. By the ſame [e], ſpeaking of Papias.

Ἐκτίθεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν, περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει.

He mentions another hiſtory concerning a woman accuſed of many crimes before our Lord, which is contained in the *Goſpel according to the Hebrews*.

This paſſage is generally underſtood, as though Euſebius had ſaid, that Papias made uſe of this Goſpel; ſo Uſher, Simon, Pearſon, Grabe, &c. But that this is a miſtake, I ſhall ſhew hereafter.

[a] Homil. xv. in Jerem.
[b] Catal. vir. illuſtr. in Jacobo.
[c] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.
[d] Ibid. c. 27.
[e] Ibid. c. 39.

9. By

9. By Epiphanius, who has preſerved large fragments of this Goſpel; moſt of which are collected by Dr. Grabe. I ſhall endeavour to produce all the places. The firſt is [a].

Ἔχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραϊστί· πάρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη, Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἔτι σώζεται. Οὐκ οἶδα δὲ, εἰ καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἄχρι Χριστοῦ περιεῖλον.

They (i. e. the Nazarenes) have *the Goſpel of Matthew moſt entire in the Hebrew language among them:* for this truly is ſtill preſerved among them, as it was at firſt, in Hebrew characters. But I know not, whether they have taken away the genealogy from Abraham to Chriſt.

10. By the ſame [b].

Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον· τέτῳ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ, ὡς καὶ οἱ κατὰ Κήρινθον, χρῶνται μόνῳ· καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους, ὡς τἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνῳ Ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσίν τε καὶ κήρυγμα.

They (i. e. the Ebionites) alſo receive the Goſpel according to Matthew. For this both they and the Cerinthians make uſe of, and no other. They call it *the Goſpel according to the Hebrews*; for the truth is, that Matthew is the only one of the New Teſtament writers, who publiſhed his Goſpel and preaching in the Hebrew language, and Hebrew characters.

11. By the ſame [c].

Ἐν τῷ γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ,

In that Goſpel which they (i. e. the Ebionites) have called *the Goſpel according to St. Matthew*, which is not entire and perfect, but corrupted and

[a] Epiphan. Hæreſ. 29. §. 9.
[b] Hæreſ. 30. quæ eſt Ebionit. §. 3.
[c] Ibid. §. 13.

τηριασμένῳ, Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν, ἐμφέρεται, ὅτι ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὃς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, εἶπε· Παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος, ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, καὶ Θαδδαῖον, καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Ζηλωτὴν, καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καί σε τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι. Ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύω ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν φαρισαῖοι, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα· Καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου, καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ, φησι, μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ Μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ. Ἵνα δῆθεν μετάστρέψωσι τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς ψεῦδος, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀκρίδων ποιήσωσιν

curtailed, and which they call, *The Hebrew Gospel*, it is written; "That there was a cer- "tain man called Jesus, and "he being about thirty years "of age, made choice of us. "And coming to Capernaum, "he entered into the house of "Simon called Peter, and "opening his mouth, said; "*When I passed by the Lake* "*of Tiberias, I chose John* "*and James, the sons of Ze-* "*bedee, and Simon, and An-* "*drew, and Thaddeus, and* "*Simon Zelotes, and Judas* "*Iscariot; and thee, Mat-* "*thew, sitting at the receipt* "*of custom I called, and thou* "*didst follow me. I will* "*therefore that ye be my* "*twelve Apostles for a testi-* "*mony to Israel.* And John "the Baptist was baptising, "and the Pharisees went out "to him, and were baptised, "and all Jerusalem. And "John had his garment of "camels hair, and a leathern "girdle about his loins, and "his meat (according to that "Gospel) was wild honey, "the taste of which was like "manna, or as cakes made "with honey and oil." *Thus they change the true account into a falsehood, and for locusts put cakes made with oil and*

ἐγκρίδας

ἐγκρίδας ἐν μέλιτι. Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τῆ πας' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίε ἔχει. Ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδε τῆ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰδδαίας, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένες Ἀαρὼν τῆ Ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίε καὶ Ἐλισάβετ, καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ, ἐπιφέρει, ὅτι τῆ λαῆ βαπτισθέντος ἦλθε καὶ Ἰησῆς, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τῆ Ἰωάννε· καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τῆ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τῆ Θεῆ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθόντος καὶ εἰσελθόντος εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆ οὐρανῆ λέγουσα· Σύ με εἶ ὁ υἱός ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ ἠυδόκησα. Καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννημά σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα, ὃν ἰδὼν, φησὶν, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ, Σὺ τίς εἶ, κύριε; καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανῆ πρὸς αὐτὸν, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός με ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐφ' ὃν ἠυδόκησα. Καὶ τότε, φησὶν, ὁ Ἰωάννης

honey[a]. The beginning of their Gospel was this; "It "came to pass in the days of "Herod, the king of Judea, "that John came baptising "with the baptism of repent-"ance in the river Jordan; "who was reported to be of "the family of Aaron, the "High-priest, the son of Za-"charias and Elizabeth, and "all people went out after "him." *And after several other things, it is said in this Gospel,* "That the people "being baptised, Jesus also "went and was baptised by "John; and as he ascended "out of the water, the hea-"vens were opened, and he "saw the *Holy Spirit of God* "*in the form of a dove* de-"scending and entering into "him, and a voice was made "from heaven, saying, *Thou* "*art my beloved Son, in whom* "*I am well pleased*; and then "another, *I have this day* "*begotten thee*; and suddenly "there shone around the place "a great light; which when "John saw (says this Gospel), "he said to him, *Who art* "*thou, Lord?* and then ano-"ther voice from heaven "came to him, *This is my be-*

[a] They read the word ἐγκρίδας instead of ἀκρίδας, Mat. iii. 4.

Ἰωάννης προσπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε, Δέομαί σου, κύριε· σύ με βάπτισον. Ὁ δὲ ἐκώλυεν αὐτῷ, λέγων, ἄφες, ὅτι ἔτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα. Ὁρα δὲ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς παραπεποιημένην πανταχόθεν διδασκαλίαν, πῶς πάντα χωλὰ, λοξὰ, καὶ ἀδεμίαν ὀρθότητα ἔχοντα. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κήρινθος καὶ Καρποκρᾶς τῷ αὐτῷ χρώμενοι δῆθεν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίου διὰ τῆς γενεαλογίας βέλονται παρισᾶν ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν. Οὗτοι δὲ ἄλλά τινα διανοοῦνται· παρακόψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας, ἄρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς προεῖπον, λέγοντες· ὅτι ἐγένετο, φησὶν, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

" *loved Son, in whom I am* " *well pleaſed.* Hereupon (ac- " cording to this Goſpel) " John fell down before him, " and ſaid, *O Lord, I pray* " *thee, baptiſe me:* but he " hindered him, ſaying, *That* " *it is ſo fit, that all things* " *ſhould be fulfilled.*" See how their falſe doctrine appears every where, how all things are imperfect, diſordered, and without any truth or order! So alſo Cerinthus and Carpocrates, uſing this ſame Goſpel of theirs, would prove from the beginning of that Goſpel according to St. Matthew, viz. by the genealogy, " That Chriſt proceeded from " the ſeed of Joſeph and Ma- " ry." But they (viz. the Ebionites) have quite other ſentiments; for they have taken away the genealogy from Matthew, and accordingly begin their Goſpel, as I above ſaid, with theſe words: *It came to paſs in the days of Herod, king of Judea, &c.*

12. By the ſame [a].

Οὐ φάσκουσι δὲ ἐκ θεοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτὸν γεγεννῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐκτίσθαι ὡς ἕνα τῶν ἀρχαγγέλων, μείζονα δὲ αὐτῶν ὄντα·

They do not ſay (viz. the Ebionites) that he (Chriſt) was begotten of the Father, but made as one of the Angels; but being greater than them,

[a] Ibid. §. 16.

αὐτὸν

αὐτὸν δὲ κυριεύειν καὶ ἀγγέλων, καὶ πάντων ὑπὸ τῷ παντοκράτορος πεποιημένων· καὶ ἐλθόντα καὶ ὑφηγησάμενον, ὡς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγέλιον καλέμενον περιέχει, ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τῷ θύειν, ἡ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή. Καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ τοιαῦτά τινά ἐστι, τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδεύματα.

he has dominion over them, and all the works of the Almighty; and that he came and taught that which is contained in their Gospel, viz. "*I came to abolish sacrifices,* "*and unless ye cease to offer sa-* "*crifices, the wrath (of God)* "*shall not cease from you.*" And such as these are their tenets.

13. By Jerome: This learned writer has left us the clearest and largest account of this Gospel, that is now extant, with many fragments.

The first and principal place is that in his account of St. Matthew[a].

Matthæus qui & Levi, ex Publicano Apostolus, primus in Judæa, propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, Evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit; quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaræis qui in Berſabeæ Beroza[b], urbe Syriæ, hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit; in

Matthew, also called Levi, who became from a Publican an Apostle, was the first *who composed a Gospel of Christ, and, for the sake of those who believed in Christ among the Jews, wrote it in the Hebrew language and letters*; but it is uncertain, who it was that translated it into Greek. Moreover the Hebrew (copy) itself is to this time preserved in the library of Cæsarea, which Pamphilus, the martyr, with much diligence collected. The Nazareans, who live in

[a] Catal. vir. illustr. in Matth.

[b] So it is in my Edition for Beræa.

quo animadvertendum, quod ubicunque Evangeliſta ſive ex perſona ſua, ſive ex perſona domini Salvatoris veteris ſcripturæ teſtimoniis utitur, non ſequatur ſeptuaginta tranſlatorum auctoritatem, ſed Hebraicam; e quibus illa duo ſunt; Ex Ægypto vocavi filium meum, &, Quoniam Nazaræus vocabitur.

Beræa, a city of Syria, and make uſe of this volume, granted me the favour of writing it out, in which (Goſpel) there is this obſervable, that *wherever the Evangeliſt either cites himſelf, or introduces our Saviour as citing any paſſage out of the Old Teſtament, he does not follow the tranſlation of the LXX. but the Hebrew copies*, of which there are theſe two inſtances, viz. that [a] *Out of Egypt I have called my Son*; and that [b] *He ſhall be called a Nazarene.*

14. By the ſame in his Life of James [c], where having related many ſurpriſing accounts concerning him, he adds;

Evangelium quoque quod appellatur Secundum Hæbræos, & a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque ſermonem tranſlatum eſt, quo & Origenes ſæpe utitur, poſt reſurrectionem Salvatoris refert; Dominus autem, cum dediſſet ſindonem ſervo ſacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum, & apparuit ei; juraverat enim Jacobus ſe non comeſturum panem ab illa hora qua libarat calicem Domini, donec videret Dominum reſurgentem a mortuis; rurſuſ-

The Goſpel alſo which is called *According to the Hebrews*, and which I lately tranſlated into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often uſed, relates, "That *after our Saviour's reſurrection, when our Lord had given the linen cloth to the Prieſt's ſervant, he went to James and appeared to him; for James had ſwore*, that he would not eat bread from that hour, in which he drank the cup of the Lord, till

[a] Mat. ii. 15.
[b] Ver. 23.
[c] Catal. vir. illuſtr. in Jacobo.

que

que poſt paululum; Afferte, ait Dominus, menſam & panem; ſtatimque additur, Tulit panem & benedixit, & fregit, ac dedit Jacobo Juſto, & dixit ei, Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia reſurrexit filius hominis a dormientibus.

" he ſhould ſee the Lord riſen " from the dead. And a little " after, the Lord ſaid, *Bring* " *the table and the bread*; " and then it is added, He " took the bread, and bleſſed " it, and brake it, and gave it " to James the Juſt, and ſaid " to him, *My brother, eat* " *thy bread; for the Son of* " *man is riſen from the dead.*"

15. By the ſame [a].

In Evangelio juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico Syroque ſermone, ſed Hebraicis literis ſcriptum eſt, quo utuntur uſque hodie Nazareni, ſecundum Apoſtolos, ſive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum, quod in Cæſarienſi habetur bibliotheca, narratur hiſtoria; Ecce mater Domini & fratres ejus dicebant ei, Joannes Baptiſta baptiſat in remiſſionem peccatorum, eamus & baptiſemur ab eo; dixit autem eis, Quid peccavi, ut vadam & baptiſer ab eo? niſi forte hoc ipſum quod dixi ignorantia eſt. Et in eodem volumine, Si peccaverit, inquit, frater tuus in verbo, & ſatis tibi fecerit, ſepties in die ſuſcipe eum. Dixit illi Simon diſcipulus ejus, Septies in die? reſpondit Dominus & dixit ei,

In the *Goſpel according to the Hebrews*, which is written in the Chaldee and Syriack language, *which the Nazarenes uſe*, (and is) *That according to the Twelve Apoſtles*; or as moſt think, *according to Matthew:* which is in the library of Cæſarea, there is the following hiſtory: " Behold, the " mother and brethren of " Chriſt ſpake to him; John " the Baptiſt *baptiſes for the* " *remiſſion of ſins, let us go* " *and be baptiſed by him*: He " ſaid to them, *In what have* " *I ſinned, that I have any* " *need to go and be baptiſed by* " *him? unleſs my ſaying this* " *proceed perhaps from igno-* " *rance.* And in the ſame " volume it is ſaid, *If thy* " *brother offend thee by any* " *word, and make thee ſatiſ-*

[a] Adverſus Pelagian. l. 3. in princip.

Etiam ego dico tibi, uſque ad ſeptuageſies ſepties.

" *faction, though it be ſeven* " *times in a day, thou muſt* " *forgive him.* Simon, his " Diſciple, ſaid to him, " *What! Seven times in a* " *day!* The Lord anſwered " and ſaid to him, *I tell thee* " *alſo, even till ſeventy times* " *ſeven.*"

16. By the ſame [a].

Juxta Evangelium eorum, quod Hebræo ſermone conſcriptum legunt Nazaræi; deſcendit ſuper eum omnis fons Spiritus ſancti—Porro in Evangelio cujus ſupra fecimus mentionem, hæc ſcripta reperimus: Factum eſt autem quum aſcendiſſet Dominus de aqua, deſcendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti, & requievit ſuper eum, & dixit ei: Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis exſpectabam te ut venires, & requieſcerem in te; tu es enim requies mea; tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in ſempiternum.

According to *their Goſpel, which is written in the Hebrew language, and read by the Nazarenes*, the whole fountain of the Holy Ghoſt deſcended upon him—Beſides, in that Goſpel juſt mentioned we find theſe things written: " It came to paſs when the " Lord aſcended from the wa- " ter, the whole fountain of " the Holy Ghoſt deſcended " and reſted upon him, and " ſaid to him, *My Son, among* " (or during all the time " of) *all the Prophets, I was* " *waiting for thy coming, that* " *I might reſt upon thee; for* " *thou art my reſt; thou art* " *my firſt begotten Son, who* " *ſhalt reign to everlaſting* " *ages.*"

17. By the ſame [b].

Sed & in Evangelio, quod juxta Hebræos ſcriptum Na-

But it is written in the Goſpel according to the Hebrews,

[a] Lib. 4. Comment. in Jeſai. c. xi. 2.

[b] Lib. 11. Comment. in Jeſai. xl. 11.

zaræi

zaræi lectitant, Dominus loquitur: Modo tulit me mater mea Spiritus Sanctus.

which the Nazarenes read, "The Lord ſaid, *The Holy* "*Ghoſt, my Mother, juſt now* "*laid hold on me.*"

18. By the ſame [a].

Qui legerit Canticum Canticorum, & ſponſum animæ Dei ſermonem intellexerit, credideritque Evangelio, quod ſecundum Hebræos editum nuper tranſtulimus, in quo ex perſona Salvatoris dicitur, Modo tulit me mater mea Spiritus Sanctus in uno capillorum meorum; non dubitabit dicere Sermonem Dei ortum eſſe de Spiritu, & animam, quæ ſponſa Sermonis eſt, habere ſocrum Spiritum Sanctum, qui apud Hebræos genere dicitur fœminino.

Whoever reads the Book of Canticles, and will underſtand by the ſpouſe of the ſoul the word of God [b], and will believe the Goſpel which is intitled, *The Goſpel according to the Hebrews*, which I lately tranſlated, in which our Saviour is introduced, ſaying, "*Juſt now my mother, the* "*Holy Ghoſt, laid hold on me* "*by one of my hairs,*" will not ſcruple to ſay, the word of God (i. e. Chriſt) was born of the ſpirit, and the ſoul, which is the ſpouſe of the word (Chriſt), has the Holy Ghoſt for its mother in law, who in the Hebrew language is expreſſed in the feminine gender.

19. By the ſame [c].

In Evangelio, quod juxta Hebræos Nazaræi legere conſueverunt, inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris ſui ſpiritum contriſtaverit.

In that which is intitled, *The Goſpel according to the Hebrews*, it is reckoned among the chief of crimes, *for a perſon to make ſorrowful the heart of his brother.*

[a] Lib. 2. Comment. in Mic. vii. 6.

[b] I ſuppoſe, by *ſermo* is meant Chriſt, called ſo often the λόγος.

[c] Lib. 6. Comment. in Ezek. xviii. 7.

20. By the ſame [a].

In Evangelio, quod appellatur ſecundum Hebræos, pro ſuperſubſtantiali pane reperi מחר, quod dicitur craſtinum, ut ſit ſenſus; panem noſtrum craſtinum, i. e. futurum, da nobis hodie.

In the Goſpel, intitled, *according to the Hebrews*, I find inſtead of ſuperſubſtantial bread, מחר *(Machar)*, which ſignifies *the morrow*; ſo the ſenſe is, *Give us this day the bread neceſſary for the morrow*, i. e. for the future.

21. By the ſame [b].

In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni & Ebionitæ (quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo ſermone tranſtulimus, & quod vocatur a pleriſque Matthæi authenticum) Homo iſte, qui aridam habet manum, cæmentarius ſcribitur, iſtiuſmodi vocibus auxilium precans; Cæmentarius eram, manibus victum quæritans; precor te, Jeſu, ut mihi reſtituas ſanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos.

In the Goſpel, *which the Nazarenes and Ebionites uſe* (which I lately tranſlated out of Hebrew into Greek, and which is by moſt eſteemed *the authentick Goſpel of Matthew*) the man who had the withered hand is ſaid to be a maſon, and prayed for relief in the following words: "*I was a* "*maſon, who got my livelihood* "*by my hands; I beſeech thee,* "*Jeſus, that thou wouldſt re-* "*ſtore me to my ſtrength, that* "*I may no longer thus ſcanda-* "*louſly beg my bread.*"

22. By the ſame [c].

In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni, pro filio Barachiæ, filium Joiadæ reperimus ſcriptum.

In the Goſpel, *which the Nazarenes uſe*, for the ſon of Barachiah I find written the ſon of Joiada [d].

[a] Lib. 1. Comment. in Matth. vi. 11.

[b] Lib. 2. Comment. in Matth. xii. 13.

[c] Lib. iv. Comment. in Matth. xxiii.

[d] See Matt. xxiii. 35.

23. By

23. By the same [a].

Iste (Barabbas) in Evangelio quod scribitur juxta Hebræos, filius magistri eorum interpretatur, qui propter seditionem & homicidium fuerat condemnatus.

In the Gospel, intitled, *according to the Hebrews*, he (Barabbas) is interpreted *The Son of their Master* [b], who was condemned for sedition and murder.

24. By the same [c].

In Evangelio, cujus sæpe fecimus mentionem, superliminare templi infinitæ magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum legimus.

In the Gospel, which I have often mentioned, we read, *that a lintel of the Temple of an immense size was broken and rent* (viz. at our Saviour's crucifixion.)

25. By the same [d].

In Evangelio autem, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum est, legimus non velum templi scissum, sed superliminare templi miræ magnitudinis corruisse.

In *that Gospel, which is written in Hebrew letters*, we read, not that the veil of the temple was rent, *but that a lintel (or beam) of a prodigious size fell down.*

26. By the same [e].

In Hebraico quoque Evangelio legimus, Dominum ad discipulos loquentem, & Nunquam, inquit, læti sitis, nisi cum fratrem vestrum videritis in charitate.

In the *Hebrew Gospel* we read, that our Lord said to his Disciples, "*Be ye never cheerful,* "*unless when you can see your* "*brother in love.*"

[a] Lib. 4. Comment. in Matth. xxvii. 16.

[b] So Barabbas signifies, being derived from בר רבי the Son of a Rabbi, or Master.

[c] Id. ibid.

[d] Epist. ad Hedib. cxlix.

[e] Lib. 3. Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes. c. 5. v. 4.

27. By

27. By the ſame [a].

Cum enim Apoſtoli eum putarent ſpiritum, vel, juxta Evangelium quod lectitant Nazaræi, incorporale Dæmonium, dixit eis, Quid turbati eſtis, &c.

For when the Apoſtles ſuppoſed him to be a Spirit, or, according to *the Goſpel which the Nazarenes read*, an *incorporeal Dæmon*, he ſaid to them, *Why are ye troubled, &c.*

28. By the ſame, concerning Ignatius.

In Epiſtola ad Smyrnæos—de Evangelio quod nuper a me tranſlatum eſt, ſuper perſona Chriſti ponit teſtimonium dicens, Ego vero & poſt reſurrectionem in carne eum vidi, & credo quia ſit: et quando venit ad Petrum, & ad eos qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis, Ecce palpate me, & videte, quia non ſum Dæmonium incorporale; & ſtatim tetigerunt eum, & crediderunt.

In the Epiſtle to the Smyrneans, he takes a teſtimony from the Goſpel which I lately tranſlated, as ſpoken by Chriſt; he ſays, I ſaw Chriſt in the fleſh after the reſurrection, and believe that it was he; and when he came to Peter, and to thoſe who were with Peter, he ſaid unto them, *Behold, feel me, and ſee that I am not an incorporeal Spirit*; and preſently they touched him, and believed.

Theſe are all the places I have met with in the writers within the limits of my time, except that Epiphanius tells us, that a certain Jew, called Joſeph, found in a cell at Tiberias, in the time of Conſtantine, τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Ἑβραϊκὸν φυτὸν, viz. *the Hebrew Goſpel aſcribed to Matthew* [b].

[a] Præfat. lib. xviii. Comment. in Jeſai.

[b] Hæreſ. 30. Ebion. §. 6.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

The various Sentiments of later Writers concerning the Goſpel of the Nazarenes. The Opinions of Beda, Sixtus Senenſis, Cardinal Baronius, Caſaubon, Grotius, Father Simon, Du Pin, Dr. Grabe, Mr. Toland, Mr. Nye, Mr. Richardſon, Dr. Mill, Dr. Whitby, Mr. Fabritius, Mr. Le Clerc, and Dr. Mangey.

HAVING in the preceding chapter produced the antient Teſtimonies and Fragments of the Hebrew Goſpel of the Nazarenes, I proceed as I propoſed;

II. *To give as ſuccinct an account as I can of the opinions of later writers concerning it.* And to this I am the rather induced, becauſe ſeveral men of learning have entertained ſo high ſentiments of this antient book, as *not only to make it Canonical, but thereby alſo more valuable than our preſent Greek Goſpel of St. Matthew,* which in conſequence muſt be rejected as Apocryphal.—I deſign here all poſſible brevity, and therefore ſhall not produce the authors' words at large, as in the former chapter, but only give a compendious abſtract account of what they have ſaid; for the juſtneſs of which I ſhall refer the readers to the books themſelves, as cited at the bottom of the page. The authors which I have ſelected I have placed in the following order, according to the time of their writing, viz. Beda, Sixtus Senenſis, Baronius, Caſaubon, Grotius, Father Simon, Du Pin, Dr. Grabe, Mr. Toland, Mr. Nye, Mr. Richardſon, Dr. Mill, Dr. Whitby, Mr. Fabritius, Mr. Le Clerc, and Dr. Mangey.

1. Beda [a], a writer of the ſeventh century, ſaith, *that the Goſpel according to the Hebrews is not to be eſteemed among the Apocryphal, but Eccleſiaſtical hiſtories, becauſe Jerome himſelf,*

[a] Comment. in Luc. 1. apud Sixt. Senenſ. p. 64.

who

who tranſlated the ſacred Scriptures, has taken many teſtimonies out of it, and tranſlated it into Greek and Latin.

2. Sixtus Senenſis, in his excellent Bibliotheca [a], is of opinion, that the Goſpel of the Ebionites *was only* the Goſpel of Matthew in Hebrew *interpolated and corrupted by thoſe hereticks, and that the Nazarene Goſpel was received by the moſt antient Fathers among other ſacred* (venerandas) *Scriptures, for the edification of the Church.*

3. Baronius (as Caſaubon interprets his words) ſaith [b], *The preſent Greek text of St. Matthew is of no value nor authority, unleſs it were to be compared with the Hebrew Goſpel of the Nazarenes, which he looks upon as the true original.*

4. Caſaubon [c] affirms and proves the contrary, viz. That if the Hebrew Goſpel were ſtill extant, *it were not to be looked upon as the original authentick text of St. Matthew*, becauſe it was only made uſe of by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, hereticks, and a *work full of fables and corruptions of various ſorts.*

5. Grotius *ſuppoſes this Goſpel to have been made out of the original Hebrew of St. Matthew, and that in it were ſome accounts not written by him, but ſuch as the Nazarenes received by tradition, and by degrees inſerted into their copies; from whence the difference aroſe between the Greek and Hebrew books* [d].

6. Father Simon has carried the authority of this Goſpel to a very great height; and ſpent two whole chapters [e] in endeavouring to ſupport it. The ſubſtance of what he ſays is; *That St. Matthew firſt wrote his Goſpel in Hebrew; that it*

[a] Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 2. p. 63, 64.

[b] Annal. ad Ann. Chri. XXXIV. Num. clxxv. and Caſaub. adverſ. Baron. Annal. exercit. xvi. c. 115.

[c] Loc. jam citat. & exercit. 15. c. 12.

[d] Annot. in Titul. Matth.

[e] Critic. Hiſtor. of the New Teſt. part 1. c. 7, 9.

was

was composed for the primitive Christians of Palestine, called Nazarenes, who are not to be looked upon as hereticks; that if this their Hebrew copy were extant, it were to be preferred to the Greek Version which we now have; that it is not to be looked upon as Apocryphal, or a false book, nor to be compared with the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the Acts of Barnabas, the Prophecy of Cham, and other books that have been forged by impostors, but really a composure of St. Matthew; and as for the additions afterwards inserted in it, they are not false, but annexed by the Nazarenes, as what they had from good and undoubted testimonies, and therefore not to be rejected. He heartily *wishes, it were now extant, even with all the interpolations of the Nazarenes and Ebionites*; and adds, that *even thus it should not be reckoned among the forgeries of impostors, but as the most antient Act of the Christian religion, and consequently preferable to our present Greek copies of St. Matthew, which are not a very just translation.*

7. Mr. Du Pin[a] has very much the same sentiments with Father Simon, only with this difference (which is indeed every where visible in the writings of those two French criticks), that he delivers his thoughts with a more becoming softness and modesty.

8. Dr. Grabe[b] seems to have treated the subject with more accuracy, and supposes, that the Gospel of the Nazarenes *was not a forgery of those hereticks, because it* was not only translated by Jerome, but *appealed to or cited by many of the old Christian writers, Ignatius, Papias, Justin Martyr, &c. That it was not any Gospel of St. Matthew's altered, corrupted, and interpolated; but an honest composure of the Jewish converts at Jerusalem, soon after our Saviour's ascension, and some time before any of our present Canonical Gospels were written; that it afterwards had affixed to it the title of Matthew by the artifice of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, who knowing St. Matthew's*

[a] Hist. of the Canon. Vol. II. c. 2. §. 3.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. I. p. 15, &c.

Gospel

Goſpel was wrote in Hebrew, thereby more eaſily impoſed their own upon the world, which was written in that language under his name.

9. Mr. Toland [a] tells us, the Ebionites or Nazarenes, *who were the oldeſt Chriſtians, had a different copy of St. Matthew's Goſpel, and that this is by ſeveral maintained to be the original of St. Matthew* [b]. This author has given us his opinion more largely in a late diſingenuous Tract againſt the Chriſtian religion [c]. Having deſcribed his Nazarenes (who denied the Godhead of Chriſt) as the original and only true Chriſtians, and ſuch as could not be miſtaken, he mentions their books [d]. Among others *they had* (ſays he) *a Goſpel of their own, ſometimes called by Eccleſiaſtical writers,* The Goſpel of the Hebrews, and ſometimes The Goſpel of the Twelve Apoſtles, *but ignorantly miſtaken by Irenæus, Epiphanius, and others, for the Goſpel of Matthew interpolated.* This *Goſpel was publickly read in their Churches, as authentick, for three hundred years; which might very well be for the moſt part, and yet the other Goſpels be never the leſs authentick alſo. It might be one of thoſe many mentioned by St. Luke, as written before his own, and which he does not reject as falſe or erroneous, or for any other reaſon——Diverſe pious and learned men regret highly the loſs of it—It was tranſlated into Greek and Latin by Jerome, who very often makes uſe of it, as likewiſe did Origen and Euſebius, not rejecting it as Apocryphal, nor receiving it as Canonical, but placing it among what they called* Eccleſiaſtical books, i. e. *books whoſe antiquity they were not able to deny, but whoſe authority they were not willing to acknowledge. Long before theſe,* the Goſpel of the Hebrews *was by Papias, Ignatius, Clemens Alexandrinus, and others, alledged as a true Goſpel. So it ſeems to have been by Juſtin Martyr. So it was by Hegeſippus, &c.*

10. Mr. Nye ſuppoſes [e] not only that the Ebionites and

[a] Amyntor. p. 64.
[b] Toll. p. 35.
[c] Nazarenus.
[d] Chap. XX.
[e] Anſwer to Amyntor. p. 76, &c.

Nazarenes

Nazarenes *were different sects, but that they had different Gospels.* He blames Epiphanius for calling the *things added in this Gospel,* Adulterations. *That they are preserved by Eusebius, Jerome, Austin, Photius* (which by the way is so very false, that neither Austin nor Photius have once mentioned this Gospel, nor Eusebius preserved one fragment): *That it were highly to be valued, if extant.* He adds a conjecture concerning the difference between St. Matthew's and the Ebionites copies, more ingenious than well-grounded, viz. *That St. Matthew published two editions of his Gospel.* In the first *he began at the baptism of John, which is now chap.* 3. In the second *he began, as our present copies, with the genealogy.* The Ebionites made their copies from the first edition, and thence proceeded the difference.

11. Mr. Richardson [a]. *The Gospel according to the Hebrews was* (as we may learn from Epiphanius and Jerome) *the Gospel of St. Matthew in Hebrew, but with several interpolations and additions of their own, though without making any alterations in what they found in the authentick copies before.—The Ebionites corrupted the Gospel of Matthew in several more particulars than the Nazarenes, who only added some historical passages from tradition, several of which might be true, and if not pretending to be wrote by St. Matthew, ought not to be called spurious, or a forgery.*

12. Dr. Mill [b] has borrowed his sentiments of this Gospel from Dr. Grabe, viz. *that it was not at all the same with* the true Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, *but made before it by some Jewish Christians at Jerusalem.* Only there seems this difference, that as Dr. Grabe imagines it to *have been abused by the Nazarenes afterwards, Dr. Mill supposes not only this, but several erroneous and heterodox things to have been in it at its first writing.*

[a] Canon vindicated, pag. 69, &c. [b] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 42.

13. Dr.

13. Dr. Whitby [a], attempting to prove that St. Matthew's Goſpel was originally wrote in Greek, and not in Hebrew, concludes concerning this Goſpel of the Hebrews, *That it was not the true authentick Goſpel of St. Matthew*; that it was *not a copy of St. Matthew's Goſpel free from interpolations and additions, but St. Matthew's Goſpel tranſlated out of Greek into Hebrew, with the ſame liberty as the Chaldee paraphraſes of the Old Teſtament, viz. with the addition of ſeveral things from tradition; which Verſion the primitive Chriſtians, who were ignorant of that language, finding in their hands, they from the likeneſs of the thing, and the pretenſions of the Jews, might think it an original, written for their uſe.*

14. Mr. Fabritius [b] cenſures Mr. Toland, for his having too highly extolled this Apocryphal Goſpel, as well as for the whole deſign of his Nazarenus; and a little after adds [c]; By all the fragments of this Goſpel it is evident, that *it was very different from the Canonical one of Matthew.*

15. Mr. Le Clerc [d] is of the ſame opinion with Dr. Whitby, as above.

16. Dr. Mangey [e], ſpeaking of the Nazarenes, obſerves, that *they uſed not the Goſpel of St. Matthew, but a particular Goſpel of their own:* and in another place afterwards [f], *They pretended, in order to gain better terms from the other believers, to uſe an Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew* (which, by the way, probably cauſed the erroneous opinion of that Goſpel being originally wrote in Hebrew): but this was a falſe pretence; *for the Goſpel* according to the Hebrews, *which they followed, was very different from ours of St. Matthew, as appears not only by the remaining fragments of it, but from the teſtimony of Jerome*, who affirms that he tranſlated it both into Greek and

[a] Preface to the Goſpels, p. 46, 47.
[b] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſtam. tom. 3. p. 541.
[c] P. 546.
[d] Diſſert. III. annexed to his Harm. of the Goſpel.
[e] Remarks on Nazarenus, chap. vi. p. 35.
[f] Ibid. chap. viii. p. 58, 59.

Latin.

Latin.——*They submitted not to the received writings of the Apostles, but followed a chimerical* forged Gospel of their own.

Thus I have collected the most considerable opinions, if not all of any value, that have been published by later writers, concerning the Gospel of the Hebrews.

CHAP. XXVII.

The Gospel of the Nazarenes highly esteemed by many Writers, because they imagined it was cited by the primitive Christians in their Writings. This proved to be a Mistake. No Christian Writer of the first four Centuries has cited or appealed to this Gospel, believing it to be of any Authority. A notorious Inadvertency of many learned men, whereby they supposed that Papias cited it. A Character of Papias. No Version made of the Nazarene Gospel before that of Jerome. Another Mistake of Jerome and other learned Men, in supposing that Ignatius used this Gospel.

HAVING given so large an account in the preceding Chapter of the sentiments of learned men concerning the Gospel of the Nazarenes, I proceed here to consider *the real value and authority of it.* I design not to enter into any large criticism upon these various opinions, nor yet to interpose my own; my business being not so much to do this, as to set forth its true authority. I proceed therefore in the method which I proposed; viz. to shew,

III. *That* the Gospel of the Nazarenes *was never received by any primitive Writer as Canonical, neither cited nor appealed to, as of any authority, by any one writer of the first four centuries.*

I am very sensible, that I here am about to oppose the sentiments of many learned men, who have unwarily been betrayed into an extravagant opinion of this Gospel, by a

groundless presumption, that the Fathers have cited it, without a due enquiry into the matter. Thus the learned Sixtus Senensis says, it was *received by the most antient Fathers among other sacred Scriptures, for the edification of the Church.* See above, Chap. XXVI. Numb. II. Baronius and Simon judge it *for the same reason preferable to our present Greek copies of St. Matthew.* The *most* antient *Ecclesiastical writers* (says Simon[a]) *have cited it as the true Gospel of St. Matthew.* Dr. Grabe was for the same reason induced to his high opinion of it, viz. *because he thought it was cited by Papias, Hegesippus, Ignatius, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and others, even for the confirmation of the great articles of Religion*[b]. But no one has been so extravagantly positive, and unpardonably mistaken in this matter as Mr. Toland[c], who tells us, *It was read in the Christian Churches for three hundred years, not rejected by Origen and Eusebius, but alledged as a true Gospel by Papias, Ignatius, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, and others.* This therefore being the main foundation of this Gospel's credit, will require a more critical enquiry; and this I shall attempt by shewing, *that not one of these Fathers received it with any authority, but almost every one expressly rejected it as Apocryphal.*

The first is Papias, *who is generally esteemed by all those who have wrote on these subjects to have made use of the Gospel of the Hebrews.* Thus thought the learned Archbishop Usher[d]; thus Dr. Grabe[e], Fabritius[f], Bishop Pearson[g], and others. Father Simon and Toland are more egregiously mistaken; the former asserts[h], *That Papias, who lived with the disciples of the Apostles, saith, that the history of the woman accused of many sins before our Saviour* is to be read in the Gospel that was called according to the Hebrews; the latter[i], that *Papias alledges it as a true Gospel.* But in this these writers are

[a] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. par. 1. c. 7. p. 61.
[b] Spicileg. Patr. Sæcul. I. p. 24.
[c] Nazaren. chap. 20. p. 78, &c.
[d] In Epist. ad Smyrn. Ignat. Not. 23. p. 48.
[e] Lib. cit. p. 17.
[f] Cod. Apoc. Nov. Testam. t. 1. p. 356.
[g] Vindic. Ignat. Epist. par. 2. c. 9. p. 102.
[h] Loc. jam cit. p. 67.
[i] Loc. jam cit.

all

all plainly miſtaken; for there can be nothing more evident, than that they did not rightly conſider the words of Euſebius, which are the foundation of their opinion; he mentions indeed ſuch a hiſtory as expounded by Papias, but then adds in his own words [a], *It is contained in the Goſpel of the Hebrews*; and does not ſo much as *intimate that Papias took it thence.* Nothing therefore ſeems more probable, than that this hiſtory was related by Papias, not out of any book, but as what he had received by tradition. To confirm which I obſerve,

1. That he is called by Irenæus [b], *a diſciple of St. John, a friend of Polycarp, and an antient author*, and conſequently might be very likely to receive many true accounts and hiſtories of our Saviour, which are not in our preſent Goſpels, ſuch as his maſter St. John ſpeaks of, chap. xxi. 25.

2. *Papias himſelf declares* [c], *that he received his accounts of Chriſtianity from thoſe* τῶν ἐκείνοις γνωρίμων, *who were intimately acquainted with the Apoſtles, and that theſe accounts, which he thus received from the older Chriſtians, and had committed to memory, he would inſert in his books.*

3. Add to this what he farther ſays [d], that *he was very ſolicitous to be informed of every thing he could by tradition, and ſpared no pains to know what the Apoſtles had ſaid and preached, valuing ſuch information* (as he ſays) *more than what was written in books.*

From all this it is manifeſt, not only that Papias did not cite the Nazarene Goſpel, but that he related this hiſtory of the woman accuſed before Chriſt, only as a fact that he had heard, or received by tradition. I might add here, that Papias cannot be ſuppoſed to have made uſe of this Hebrew Goſpel, becauſe he did not underſtand the language in which it was written, as it ſeems not unreaſonable to conclude from his being Biſhop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, where every one knows the Hebrew could not be underſtood.

It may indeed be objected, that Papias *made uſe of a Greek Verſion, and ſo could make his citation thence*; and accordingly

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39. in fine.
[b] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 5. c. 23.
[c] Præfat. in Opp. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39. In init.
[d] Ibid.

I obſerve, that Father Simon ſuppoſes [a], that our *Greek Verſion*, as he calls it, of St. Matthew, *and many others, were made out of this Hebrew Goſpel very early* [b], *even before the Nazarene interpolations.* But in this he is miſtaken; it being much more probable, no Greek Verſion was made of this Nazarene Goſpel before Jerome's time; which, as it will be of ſome importance in the following controverſy, I ſhall endeavour to ſupport by the following remarks, viz.

Firſt, There is *not the leaſt intimation in all antiquity of any ſuch Verſion* before that made by Jerome.

Secondly, Had there been one made before Jerome's, *there ſeems to have been no reaſon for his being made*, at leaſt it is probable he would have mentioned it as an imperfect tranſlation; as he uſually does in other caſes, where he ſpeaks of his own tranſlations.

Thirdly, It is probable enough, *the Jewiſh Chriſtians would be cautious to prevent their Goſpel being made publick:* as their forefathers were of the books of the Old Teſtament, who, if I miſtake not, kept an anniverſary day of humiliation on account of the LXX. Verſion being made. And hence Jerome intimates [c], that the Nazarenes at Beroea *favoured him*, when they allowed him to take a copy of it. Mr. Fabritius therefore too haſtily cenſured Jerome for making a tranſlation of a book already tranſlated; which, ſays he, Origen and others read before in Greek [d]; for as I think it at leaſt probable from what is ſaid, that there was no Verſion of it made before Jerome's, ſo it does not appear, that either Origen or others read it in Greek, or cited it; which, as I have ſhewn of Papias, I proceed to ſhew of them.

The ſecond, who is ſaid to have made uſe of this Goſpel, is Ignatius, Biſhop of Antioch, who lived in the beginning of the ſecond century. The paſſage, ſuppoſed to be by him taken out of it, is as follows [e].

[a] Crit. Hiſt. of the New Teſt. part 1. c. 7. p. 67.
[b] Ibid. c. 9. p. 78.
[c] Above, chap. xx. n. 13.
[d] Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Teſt. t. 1. p. 365.
[e] Epiſt. ad Smyrn. c. 3.

Καὶ

Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τὰς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς, Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ Δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον· καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.

And when he came to thoſe who were with Peter, he ſaid unto them, *Take, handle me, and ſee that I am not an incorporeal Dæmon*; *and preſently they touched him, and believed, being convinced by his fleſh and ſpirit.*

This is generally ſaid by the criticks to have been taken by Ignatius out of this Goſpel. So judged Baronius [a], Druſius [b], Valeſius [c], Dr. Grabe [d], and many others; whence they have formed a more high opinion of the book. That which perſuaded them to ſuppoſe it taken thence is the expreſs aſſertion of Jerome to this purpoſe: (ſee above, Chap. XXV. Numb. XXVIII.) but this will appear very improbable; for,

1. *Ignatius does not make any mention of this Goſpel either in this, or any other place of thoſe Epiſtles, which go under his name*; and therefore it may as well be ſuppoſed he cited what he had heard, as what he had read, eſpecially if we conſider him as one who lived very near the Apoſtles' times, if not in them, and at this time in a troubleſome journey under a guard of ſoldiers, and ſo deſtitute of his books [e]. Can any one imagine, that in this journey Ignatius carried the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, wrote in a language which he could ſcarce underſtand, along with him from Syria to Rome? And if he did not, is it not more probable, he cited a paſſage which he had heard by tradition, than quoted it out of this Apocryphal Goſpel? Nor am I alone in this conjecture. The great Caſaubon in the place cited, and Biſhop Pearſon [f], ſuppoſe the very ſame, viz. That Ignatius *did not take the paſſage out of the Nazarene Goſpel, but referred to ſome unwritten tradition,*

[a] Apud Caſaub. Exerc. p. 497.
[b] Obſervat. Sacr. lib. 4. c. 22.
[c] Annot. in Euſeb. lib. 3. c. 36.
[d] Loc. ſup. cit.
[e] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 36.
[f] Vindic. Epiſt. Ignat. par. 2. c. 9. p. 103, 104.

which was afterwards inſerted into the Hebrew Goſpel attributed to Matthew. But if this be not ſufficient, I obſerve, as what ſeems indeed moſt probable;

2. That the paſſage above produced is ſo very little different from the words of St. Luke, chap. xxiv. 39, that theſe ſeem to have been intended or referred to by Ignatius, and no other. This will appear by the comparing of them.

The words of Chriſt, as they are in St Luke's Goſpel.	*The words of Chriſt, as they are in Ignatius's Epiſtle.*
Ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου, καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγώ εἰμι· ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα.	Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον.
The Engliſh of St. Luke's words.	*The Engliſh of Ignatius's words.*
Behold my hands and my feet, that it is myſelf; handle me, and ſee, for a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones, as you ſee me have.	Take, handle me, and ſee, that I am not an incorporeal ſpirit (or Dæmon).

Theſe two ſentences are ſo extremely alike, not only as to the whole ſenſe and deſign of them, but even as to the very words, that if there were no other argument, this would of itſelf be ſufficient to prove the point I am contending for. But this will be much corroborated, if we conſider,

Firſt, *That the Chriſtian Fathers, eſpecially the oldeſt, were continually wont to cite the Scriptures* memoriter, *i.e. by their memories, without conſulting their copies, and ſo not expreſſing the very words of the ſacred writer whom they cited, thought it ſufficient to expreſs the ſenſe or deſign of the place.* This is evident by a thouſand inſtances, and is very well urged by Dr. Whitby[a] againſt Dr. Mill, who has very unfairly made their

[a] Examen variant. Lection. D. Millii. c. 1. §. 1, 2, &c.

memoriter

memoriter citations ſo often to be various lections, or to proceed from different copies. Nor can it ſeem ſtrange, that the Fathers did cite thus, when we ſee the ſame daily practiſed by the beſt writers. Beſides, the form of their volumes was ſuch, as occaſioned much greater difficulty to find any paſſage in them, than it now is in ours [a]. I might add farther, that they had not as yet their books diſtinguiſhed into chapters and verſes, as ours now are, &c.

Secondly, That Ignatius (as I have obſerved) was *now on a journey, under a ſtrict guard of ſoldiers*, and therefore as *he probably had not his books with him, it is not ſtrange he ſhould give only the ſenſe of St. Luke's words, and not all the words themſelves.* And this he, who will be at the pains to obſerve, may perceive in many other citations in the Epiſtles of Ignatius.

Thirdly, I obſerve, the Epiſtles of Ignatius are ſtrangely corrupted and interpolated ſince their firſt writing. This is well known, and Archbiſhop Uſher has abundantly proved it, and particularly in this ſame place [b]; from whence I conclude, that the words here were formerly perhaps more like thoſe of Luke than they are now.

To conclude, many learned men have imagined all theſe Epiſtles of Ignatius to be ſpurious, and the celebrated Mr. Daillé has endeavoured, from this very place, to prove that they are ſo [c].

[a] See my account of the antient ways of writing and form of volumes. Vindic. of St. Matt. Goſp. c. 15. p. 151, &c.

[b] Edit. Epiſtol. Ignat. in Proleg. c. 3, 4.

[c] Contr. Epiſt. Ignat. lib. 2. c. 17. p. 339, 340.

CHAP. XXVIII.

A particular Proof that neither Juſtin Martyr, Hegeſippus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Euſebius, nor Jerome have appealed to the Goſpel of the Nazarenes as of any Authority, but on the contrary rejected it, as not Canonical.

THE next who is ſuppoſed to have taken any thing out of this Goſpel is Juſtin Martyr [a], viz. *an account of a fire kindled in the river Jordan, when Chriſt was baptiſed.* Thus thought a learned friend of Mr. Dodwell's, whom he has mentioned in his Diſſertations on Irenæus [b]. But of this there is ſo little probability, no Goſpel being named by Juſtin, nay the paſſage in Juſtin being different from that in the Nazarene Goſpel, that I think it needs no farther notice, than to be conſidered among thoſe uncertain ſayings and hiſtories of Chriſt, which will be collected in *the Appendix to this volume.*

Hegeſippus (an early writer of the ſecond century) is the next who is ſuppoſed to have uſed it, and, according to Dr. Grabe, *to have had frequent recourſe to it* [c]; and Mr. Toland [d], *to have alledged it as a true Goſpel.* This they gather from a miſtaken tranſlation of theſe words of Euſebius, Ἐκ δὲ τῶν καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τῇ Συριακῇ, καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος διαλέκτου τινὰ τίθησιν [e]; thus tranſlated by Valeſius; *Nonnulla item ex Hebræorum Evangelio, & Syriaco, & ex Hebraicâ linguâ profert in medium, &c.* But I think much better rendered thus in Engliſh, *He has diſcourſed or ſaid ſome things concerning the Hebrew Goſpel, and the Syriack and Hebrew language*; for to *cite things out of the Syriack and Hebrew dialect* ſeems a very bald and incongruous expreſſion. Hence Ruffin has tranſlated it, *Diſſeruit de Evangelio ſecundum Hebræos, &c.* And there-

a Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 315.
b Diſſert. II. §. 9. p. 106.
c Lib. cit. Sæcul. 1. p. 16, 24.
d Nazar. c. 20.
e Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 22.

fore

fore Euſebius's words do not imply that Hegeſippus cited it. But ſuppoſe they did, and he really did cite it, it does not appear after what manner he cited it; and I may as well ſuppoſe he cited it to confute it, as they do that he cited it for authority, juſt as Euſebius tells us in the next words, that he mentioned ſome of the traditions of the Jews. But if it ſhould not be thus, I would ſay Hegeſippus was a Nazarene (as Mr. Toland would have him to be), becauſe he was originally a Jew [a]; and I cannot ſee any authority or credit will be procured to this Nazarene Goſpel, becauſe a Nazarene made uſe of it.

Clemens Alexandrinus is another, from whoſe citation of this Goſpel the abovementioned authors would gain credit to it; but though it is indeed cited in his works [b], yet this will prove no more favourable to their ſcheme, than the former inſtances; for,

1. *He has mentioned it* only once *in all his works*; viz. lib. 2. p. 380. Mr. Toland [c] refers indeed to a place in the firſt book; but I dare aver it is not there mentioned: but I eaſily ſee how Mr. Toland made this miſtake; he followed the falſe print of Dr. Grabe's Spicilegium, p. 26. But this is no uncommon thing with him to follow the miſtakes of the preſs. I more wonder Mr. Fabritius ſhould be guilty of the ſame in this very inſtance. But to return; if Clemens cited this Goſpel but once, it is plain he had no high opinion of it, or not ſo high as of our preſent Goſpels, which he appeals to in almoſt every page. But to put an end to the diſpute,

2. Clemens in ſo many words *denies the authority, and abſolutely rejects all Goſpels beſides thoſe four now received.* This he does more than once; ſo in the third book of his *Stromata*, p. 465; and in the fragment of his books *de Hypotypos*, preſerved by Euſebius [d], if theſe laſt be his.

3. I might here add, that Clemens *did not underſtand the Hebrew language, in which the Nazarene Goſpel was written*;

[a] See Euſeb. loc. cit.
[b] See above, chap. xxv. No. 3.
[c] Amyntor. p. 35. He has committed the very ſame blunder, as to this paſſage, in his Nazaren. p. 78.
[d] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 14.

and

and ſo could not cite it; nor could he uſe a Verſion, there being none at that time made, as has been proved.

After Clemens they reckon Origen his ſcholar, as having cited this Goſpel with regard to its authority. So Dr. Grabe would perſuade us[a], *that he took teſtimonies out of it to prove the articles of our faith*; and Mr. Toland[b], that *he alledged it as a true Goſpel.* But in this they are more notoriouſly miſtaken than in the former inſtances: For,

1. *The Goſpel of the Nazarenes was certainly the ſame with that according to the Twelve Apoſtles.* This Dr. Grabe and Mr. Toland both aſſert; but the Goſpel according to the Twelve Apoſtles is expreſsly rejected by Origen, as Apocryphal, and placed among the books of the hereticks; which were not to be received. See the place at large above, Chap. VII. Numb. V. Therefore Origen could not appeal to the authority of this Goſpel.

2. There are ſeveral places in the works of Origen, wherein he aſſerts, *there ought only four Goſpels to be received in the Church*, viz. thoſe which we now receive. See the places cited in the notes at the bottom of the page[c].

3. In both the places where he produces paſſages out of this Goſpel, he plainly intimates, *that he looked upon it as of very little credit.* Hence he introduces them both in the ſame manner; the firſt thus; *If any one will admit or receive the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, &c.* The ſecond; *It is written in a certain Goſpel, intitled,* according to the Hebrews, *if any one be pleaſed to receive it, not as of any authority, but only for illuſtration of the preſent queſtion, &c.* See the place at large above, Chap. XXV. Numb. IV, V. From all this it is evident, Origen did not eſteem this Nazarene Goſpel as of any conſiderable value or authority in the Church, but rejected it as Apocryphal.

Euſebius is the next called in to ſupport the credit of this

[a] Lib. cit. p. 24.
[b] Nazaren. c. 20. p. 80.
[c] Comment. in Matth. lib. 1. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25. & in Philocal. c. 5. p. 29.

Goſpel:

Goſpel: *He very often makes uſe of it*, ſays Mr. Toland [a], as on the contrary I affirm, he never once has made uſe of it. *He places it in the rank of dubious Scriptures, ſuch as* not only the Epiſtles of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas, ſaith Dr. Grabe [b]; *but the Epiſtles of James, Jude, and other Apoſtles:* On the contrary I affirm, *he expreſsly diſtinguiſhes theſe from it*, placing them among the Scriptures which he calls ἀντιλεγομένας, i. e. *doubted of by ſome*; but this among thoſe which he call νόθες, i. e. *ſpurious, and to be utterly rejected* [c]. I confeſs, he a little after places them all under the general title of ἀντιλεγόμεναι; but the word muſt there be taken in a more extenſive ſignification than in the former place, elſe Euſebius will not be conſiſtent with himſelf.

But if all the reſt fail, Jerome muſt make it out. He frequently, ſay they, *appeals to this Goſpel, and not only ſo, but tranſlated it into Greek and Latin:* notwithſtanding all which, a little obſervation will inform us, Jerome had no higher opinion of it than the forementioned writers. For,

1. He expreſsly ſaith, *It was the ſame with the Goſpel, intitled*, according to the Twelve Apoſtles, above, Chap. XXV. Numb. XV. *but this he expreſsly rejects as Apocryphal, in another place*, (viz. above, Chap. VII. Numb. V.) *and as a book of the hereticks, wrote by men deſtitute of the ſpirit and grace of God, without a due regard to truth.* See the paſſage at large above, Chap. VII. Numb. IV.

2. The ſame appears *from the manner of his citing it in ſeveral of the places above*, Chap. XXV. For inſtance, in that there produced, Numb. XVIII. he introduces his citation thus, *He who will believe the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, &c.* And after the citation of it in another place, as alſo a paſſage of Ignatius, he ſubjoins, *Quibus teſtimoniis ſi non uteris ad auctoritatem, utere ſaltem ad antiquitatem, &c.* "Which teſtimonies though you are not to receive as of any authority, "yet may be regarded for their antiquity, &c. [d]

[a] Loc. jam cit.
[b] Lib. jam cit. p. 16.
[c] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.
[d] Lib. 3. adv. Pelag. in principio.

From

From all this it is evident, how unjuſtly it has hitherto been aſſerted, that theſe Fathers cited or appealed to this Goſpel; and with what unpardonable falſehood Mr. Toland aſſerted its being appealed to by them in their writings frequently, as a true Goſpel. Let him henceforth for ever ceaſe his accuſations againſt the clergy, or prieſts, as he calls them, for unfair dealing and falſe quotations, as alſo his attempts againſt Chriſtianity, unleſs he can produce ſome better arguments, and proceed in ſome more honeſt method to ſupport them.

CHAP. XXIX.

Poſitive Proofs that the Goſpel of the Nazarenes was Apocryphal. It is found in none of the antient Catalogues of ſacred Books. Never was cited, as of Authority. Never read in the Churches. It contained many things apparently falſe; as, that Chriſt was a Sinner; was unwilling to be baptiſed, &c. It contained ſeveral idle Stories; as the Holy Ghoſt taking Chriſt by one of his Hairs into a high Mountain, &c. The rich man ſcratching his Head, &c. Things in it later than the Time of their being ſaid or done. The Deſign of it. Made out of Matthew. Its Age. Not equal in Authority with the preſent Greek. Made by Jews. Of the Nazarenes.

AFTER having ſo largely ſhewn, what were the ſentiments of the old Chriſtian writers concerning this *Hebrew Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, there may ſeem but little neceſſity of ſaying any thing farther to invalidate its authority. But inaſmuch as there is no other Apocryphal piece which hath been ſo highly extolled as this, and it has been ſo often preferred to our preſent Greek copies of St. Matthew, it cannot be improper, that, according to my firſt propoſal, I proceed,

IV. To demonſtrate in a more poſitive manner, *that it really was a ſpurious and Apocryphal piece.*

This

This is clear by Prop. IV. *as not being mentioned in any of the antient Catalogues*; by Prop. V. *as not being cited by any of the antient writers*; by Prop. VI. *as not being read in any of the aſſemblies of the primitive Chriſtians.* And I here cannot but take notice of a moſt notorious and villainous impoſture of Mr. Toland [a], who with all the aſſurance imaginable aſſerts, *That this Goſpel was publickly read in their Churches as authentick, for above three hundred years.* For this he cites two paſſages of St. Auſtin [b]; in neither of which there is the leaſt diſtant intimation or inſinuation of what he aſſerts: all that he ſays is, *that in his time there were ſome very few hereticks called Nazarenes, or Symmachians, who admitted both the circumciſion of the Jews, and the baptiſm of the Chriſtians.*

I add now farther, that this Goſpel of the Nazarenes is to be eſteemed Apocryphal by Prop. VIII. as containing ſeveral things *contrary to certainly known and undoubted truths*; by Prop. IX. as *containing things trifling and ſilly*; by Prop. X. as *containing things later than the time in which it pretends to have been written.*

I ſhall prove each of theſe ſeparately:

1. The Goſpel of the Nazarenes was Apocryphal, *becauſe it contained ſeveral things contrary to certainly known and undoubted truths*, by Prop. VIII. I might here inſtance in a great number of particulars contrary to one or other of our preſent Goſpels: but having not yet proved their authority, I ſhall omit theſe; and to be as juſt in my proof as I can, I ſhall only ſelect thoſe inſtances, which are contrary either to the generally agreed articles of the Chriſtian Religion, which have been proved true above, Cor. II. Prop. II. or to more than one or two of our preſent Goſpels; whoſe agreement I think may be fairly enough urged (conſidered only as any other common hiſtory) againſt the aſſertions of any one particular book.

[a] Loc. jam cit. p. 78.

[b] Contr. Fauſt. Manich. lib. 19. c. 18. T. Opp. 6. *In exigua vel in ipſa paucitate perdurant.* Contr. Creſc. Gram. l. 1. c. 31. T. Opp. 7.

1.) The

1.) The firſt inſtance of this ſort which I aſſign is that in the paſſage of Jerome above produced, Chap. XXV. Numb. XV. where it is ſaid, *The mother and brethren of Chriſt ſpake to him, and ſaid, John the Baptiſt baptiſes for the remiſſion of ſins, let us go and be baptiſed by him: He ſaid to them, In what have I ſinned, that I have need to go and be baptiſed by him? unleſs my ſaying this proceeds perhaps from ignorance.* The meaning of this paſſage will be beſt perceived from a parallel one in another Apocryphal book, intitled, *The Preaching of Peter*, hereafter to be produced: in which it was related [a], *that Chriſt confeſſed his ſins, and was compelled, contrary to his own inclinations, by his mother Mary to ſubmit to the baptiſm of John.* Now hence it follows,

Firſt, *That Chriſt was a ſinner; at leaſt, was doubtful whether he was not ſo;* but this is contrary to the whole deſign of the Chriſtian ſcheme, which is entirely founded upon the ſuppoſition of Chriſt being free from all manner of ſin, in order to his making atonement and the neceſſary ſatisfaction. See 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 Peter ii. 22. 1 John iii. 5.

Secondly, *That Chriſt was unwilling to ſubmit to the baptiſm of John.* But this is contrary to the certain notions we have of Chriſt and his conduct, who never was backward to obey any of the divine commands. Beſides, St. Matthew ſays, (chap. iii. 15.) *he compelled John to baptiſe him*; ſo far was he from being unwilling. To which it may be worth adding, that after this Goſpel had related the baptiſm of Jeſus by John, it a little after adds, that John was deſirous to be baptiſed by Jeſus, and then confounding St. Matthew's words, ſays that of Chriſt's denying John baptiſm, which St. Matthew ſays of John's denying Chriſt baptiſm, and makes Chriſt to give that as a reaſon for his not baptiſing John, which St. Matthew ſays he gave as a reaſon for his being baptiſed by John. For ſo the words of it are related by Epiphanius, (above, Chap. XXV. Numb. XI.) *John fell down before him and ſaid, O Lord, I pray thee baptiſe me: but he hindered him, ſaying, that it is ſo fit all things ſhould be fulfilled*; on which that

[a] Tract. de non iterand. Baptiſm. ad calc. Opp. Cypriani.

Father

Father juſtly cenſures that Goſpel for *falſehood*, *diſorder*, and *confuſion*.

2.) The next inſtance of falſehood I obſerve in that Goſpel is that hiſtory related by Jerome, (above, Chap. XXV. Numb. XIV.) *concerning James's oath, that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he drank the cup of the Lord, till he ſhould ſee the Lord riſen from the dead, &c.* This is not only an idle fable, but contrary to known fact; for it has been long a very juſt obſervation, that as our *Lord's Diſciples ſeem to have had few higher expectations from him than the advancements of a temporal kingdom*[a]; *ſo they either did not believe, or but faintly believe, that he ſhould be put to death, and riſe again.* As to their diſbelief of his reſurrection (which is all I have to do with now), the matter is very eaſily gathered from the whole conduct of the Apoſtles before his crucifixion, but eſpecially from the relations of our Evangeliſts of what happened afterwards. So Mark tells us, that when Mary Magdalen *had ſeen him after his reſurrection, ſhe told his Diſciples that he was alive, and had been ſeen of her*; but they believed her not[b]; as alſo, *when two of the Apoſtles had ſeen him, and affirmed it to the reſt*, they did not believe them[c]; *and that upon Chriſt's appearing to them all aſſembled*, he upbraided them for their unbelief and hardneſs of heart, becauſe they believed not them which had ſeen him after he was riſen[d]. St. Luke expreſſes this ſomewhat more ſtrongly, viz. that when report was made to the Apoſtles of Chriſt's reſurrection, *The words of them* (who related it) *ſeemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not*[e]. And St. John, ſpeaking of himſelf and Peter[f], ſaith, *They knew not the Scripture as yet*, that Chriſt muſt riſe again from the dead. Now after ſuch plain teſtimonies, there is not any room left to queſtion the truth of the fact, which by conſequence demonſtrates the falſehood of the Nazarene Goſpel, which ſuppoſes the Apoſtle James, not only before Chriſt died, to be perſuaded of his death, but alſo to be very poſitive

[a] See my Vindic. of Matthew, c. 12. p. 117, 118.
[b] Chap. xvi. 9, 10, 11.
[c] V. 12, 13.
[d] V. 14.
[e] Ch. xxiv. 11.
[f] Ch. xx. 9.

in

in his belief, both before his crucifixion and afterwards, that he ſhould riſe again.

3.) To the two former may be added the account Jerome more than once gives us out of it, that at our Saviour's crucifixion a *large lintel, or beam of the temple* (ſee above, Chap. XXV. Numb. XXIV, XXV.) *was rent and fell down*, contrary to three of our Evangeliſts, who ſay, this happened *to the veil of the temple*[a] at that time.

2. I argue farther, that this Hebrew Goſpel was Apocryphal by Prop IX. *as it contained ſeveral ludicrous and trifling, or ſilly and fabulous relations.* Such certainly is that (referred to by Origen above, Chap. XXV. Numb. IV. and Jerome, Numb. XVIII. as alſo Numb. XVII.) concerning *Chriſt's ſaying, that his mother, the Holy Ghoſt, laid hold of him by one of his hairs, and carried him into the great mountain Thabor, &c.* And that of the Holy Ghoſt's ſaying, *My Son, during all the time of the Prophets I was waiting for thee, that I might reſt upon thee, for thou art my reſt*; mentioned by Jerome, Numb. XVI. *Such is that of the rich man's ſcratching his head*, when Chriſt bad him ſell all, and give to the poor, mentioned by Origen, Numb. V.

3. It may be farther proved Apocryphal by Prop. X. *as it contained things later than the times of their being ſaid, or in which it pretended to be written.* Such ſeems to me that declaration ſaid to be made by our Saviour above, (Chap. XXV. Numb. XII.) *that he came to aboliſh all ſacrifices, and denounce the wrath of God upon all thoſe who did ſacrifice.* It is certain from the whole of our Saviour's conduct, that he was more careful than to give any ſuch offence to the Jews, and purpoſely declined all ſuch expreſs oppoſition to, and aboliſhment of, the Moſaick œconomy, as in ſeveral other inſtances is obvious to obſerve. I take this therefore to be the forgery of a perſon, who lived not only after our Saviour's time, but even after the time of St. Matthew's writing, when the controverſy was hot between the Gentile and Judaiſing Chriſtians. Such alſo

[a] Mat. xxvii. 51. Mark xv. 38. Luke xxiii. 45.

ſeems

ſeems to me that compellation, with which our Saviour addreſſes himſelf to James (in that paſſage of Jerome, Numb. XIV.) Mi frater, *my brother*; a title not known to be given by our Saviour, nor in thoſe early times when St. Matthew wrote, but afterwards very common among the Chriſtians.

Thus much may ſuffice to prove the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, Apocryphal; I ſhall conclude with a ſhort account,

V. Of what ſeems moſt probable to me, *of the nature and deſign of this famous book, with ſome ſhort account of the hereticks who received it.*

I take it to *have been an early tranſlation of the Greek Goſpel of St. Matthew into Hebrew, with the addition of many fabulous relations and erroneous doctrines, compoſed in the name of the Twelve Apoſtles, by ſome convert or converts to Chriſtianity among the Jews, who with their profeſſion of Chriſt retained their zeal and affection for the law of Moſes, with the moſt prepoſterous and abſurd notions concerning Chriſt and the Chriſtian religion.*

The ſeveral parts of this hypotheſis will appear by the following aphoriſms.

1. *The Goſpel of St. Matthew was originally written in Greek, and not in Hebrew.* This I having ſo largely proved in another book ſhall take here for granted. See Vindication of St. Matthew's Goſpel, Chap. XVII, XVIII, XIX.

2. *That the Nazarene Goſpel was compiled out of St. Matthew's is very evident*, becauſe it is ſo frequently called by his name (as above), which cannot be imagined to have happened upon any other ſuppoſition, ſince there was another Goſpel extant under his name. One remark I have made out of a Fragment of it in Epiphanius, Chap. preced. Numb. XI. which ſeems to me to demonſtrate, that it was made out of St. Matthew's Greek. For whereas in this we read, chap. iii. 4. That *John the Baptiſt's food in the wilderneſs was* ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον, i. e. *locuſts and wild honey*; inſtead thereof in the

Nazarene Goſpel we read, *his food was* μέλι ἄγριον οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τῦ Μάννα ὡς ἐγκρίς, *wild honey, whoſe taſte was like manna, or cakes made with honey and oil.* Now foraſmuch as it is certain, that locuſts were a very common food in thoſe Eaſtern countries, as is undeniably proved by Bochart [a], and ſuch food ſeems very agreeable to the reſt of John's way of life, it is but reaſonable to conclude our preſent Greek reading (viz. ἀκρίδες) to be the true and authentic one; and if ſo, then it is evident that this Nazarene Goſpel was a tranſlation of St. Matthew's Greek, and that the Tranſlator read ἐγκρίδες inſtead of ἀκρίδες, and being a Jew, accuſtomed to the uſe of the Septuagint Greek Bibles, very probably was led thereto by the Septuagint tranſlation of thoſe words, Exod. xvi. 31. Τὸ δὲ γεῦμα αὐτῦ ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν μέλιτι, or as it is in Num. xi. 8. Καὶ ἦν ἡ ἡδονὴ αὐτῦ ὡσεὶ γεῦμα ἐγκρὶς ἐξ ἐλαίυ. And this by the way ſeems a very demonſtrative proof, that St. Matthew's preſent Greek was not a tranſlation out of Hebrew, ſeeing there was no poſſibility of ſuch a miſtake in reading the Hebrew word, as to tranſlate it ἀκρίδες, where it ought to have been tranſlated ἐγκρίδες.

3. That it pretended to be made by the Twelve Apoſtles, is *evident from its bearing that title*; as alſo from a paſſage of that Fragment in Epiphanius, (which is above, Numb. XI.) where we read, *there was a certain man named Jeſus, about thirty years of age, who choſe* us *to be his Apoſtles:* where it is plain the writer ſpeaks in the name of them all, or at leaſt of ſeveral; juſt as in the pretended Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles, we continually read of exhortations and commands given in the name of all the Apoſtles. Nor do I know any reaſon for diſputing whether it bore this title, ſave only that Beda is ſuppoſed to diſtinguiſh between the *Goſpel of the Hebrews*, and the *Goſpel according to the Twelve Apoſtles*, in the place above cited, Chap. XXVI. Numb. I. See the paſſage at length in Sixtus Senenſis [b]: but upon a ſtrict enquiry I do

[a] Hierozoic. par. 2. l. 4. c. 7. See alſo Sir Norton Knatchbull's Annotations on that place of Matthew.

[b] Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. p. 64. ad voc. Hebræorum.

not

not perceive that Beda has at all diſtinguiſhed them, but rather that Dr. Grabe [a], and Mr. Fabritius [b], are miſtaken in ſuppoſing he did.

4. *That it was a very early compoſure*, I make no doubt, from the early mention we have of it. It is not improbable (as I have ſaid) that it was referred to by St. Paul in his Epiſtle to the Galatians, which was written about the year of Chriſt LVII or LVIII. It was undoubtedly extant in the beginning of the ſecond century; though nothing ſeems more abſurd than Dr. Grabe's opinion, that it was written before St. Matthew wrote his. It is like ſuppoſing the child born before his father.

5. *That it had in it many idle and fabulous, as well as falſe and erroneous relations*, is largely proved already. Theſe are ſo many, and ſo very notorious, that I wonder how Father Simon could have ſo high an opinion either of theſe, or the Goſpel that contained them. Can any one unprejudiced give the preference to ſuch a heap of fables and contradictions, above St. Matthew's plain and conſiſtent accounts?

But becauſe that learned writer was ſo far prejudiced in favour of this Hebrew Goſpel, *as to prefer it to the Greek of St. Matthew, even with all theſe differences*, I would argue a little upon his own hypotheſis againſt him. Suppoſe, then, our Greek copies of St. Matthew were really a tranſlation out of the Hebrew, in which that Apoſtle firſt wrote; how came it to paſs that the Greek tranſlation ſhould be ſo very different from its original, as it is in every one of the remaining paſſages? This difference cannot be ſuppoſed to have happened but upon one of theſe two following accounts; viz. either,

Firſt, Becauſe the Verſion was made when the Hebrew original was more pure, and that theſe additions were made by the Nazarenes afterwards; or,

[a] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. I. t. 1. p. 16.

[b] Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Teſt. par. 1. p. 351.

Secondly, Becauſe the author of the Greek Verſion epitomiſed it, and altered it according to his own mind.

Father Simon [a], according as it ſerved his purpoſe, ſuppoſes both theſe, though moſt evidently contradictory to each other; ſeeing the difference could not proceed from both cauſes. But whichſoever of them we ſuppoſe true, will overthrow his hypotheſis; for *if we ſay the firſt*, viz. *that the Greek Verſion was made before the Nazarene additions*, it follows, their Goſpel muſt now be eſteemed Apocryphal, becauſe the alterations and additions were ſo great, as not to have left ſcarce any thing of St. Matthew remaining: for there is not one of all the Fragments now extant, but differs from St. Matthew's Greek; which, according to the ſuppoſition, is pure and perfect, being made before the Nazarene alterations. *If he ſay the latter*, viz. *that the difference proceeds from the fault of the Greek tranſlator*; then I anſwer, that this ſuppoſes the things in which the Nazarene Goſpel differs from St. Matthew's Greek, to be good and uſeful; which is contrary to what has been above proved.

6. This Hebrew Goſpel, or tranſlation of St. Matthew's Greek into Hebrew, with the forementioned additions and interpolations, *ſeems to have been made by ſome convert Jews, to favour their notions of mixing Judaiſm and Chriſtianity together*. That there was very early ſuch a ſort of perſons of the Jewiſh nations, who were for uniting their old religion with the new one of Chriſt, is evident from a great part of St. Paul's Epiſtles; three of which ſeem purpoſely to be written againſt them; viz. *That to the Romans*, *Galatians*, and *Hebrews*. That theſe were principally delighted with the Goſpel intitled, *According to the Hebrews* (ᾧ μάλιστα Ἑβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι χαίρουσι), we are expreſsly aſſured by Euſebius [b], as well as by many other antient writers. Of this Goſpel they had ſo prodigiouſly great an opinion, that for the ſake of it *they contemned and rejected all others, and only*

[a] See his Crit. Hiſt. of N. T. part 1. c. 7, 9.

[b] Hiſtor. Eccleſ. lib. 3. c. 25.

made

made uſe of this: ſo we are told by Irenæus [a], Euſebius [b], and others. Now hence it ſeems undeniably to follow, that there were in this Goſpel ſeveral things which favoured their peculiar notions, and conſequently that it was made by ſome Chriſtianiſed Jew, or rather Judaiſing Chriſtian [c].

That which remains is only to give ſome brief account of the Nazarenes, who uſed this Goſpel.

They are ſaid by Epiphanius *to have aroſe from ſome Chriſtian Jews, who went from Jeruſalem to Pella* [d]. It is very uncertain why they were called by this name. He who has a mind may ſee a plauſible account in Dr. Mangey's *Anſwer to Mr. Toland's Nazarenus*, c. viii. Out of theſe ſprang the Ebionites, who had in a great meaſure the ſame opinions with the Nazarenes [e], and yet are made two diſtinct ſects by Epiphanius. The truth is, they are ſo confounded by that Father, that one can ſcarce tell how to give any clear account of them. But to do it in the beſt manner I can, I ſhall give the reader an abſtract out of Irenæus, Euſebius, and Epiphanius, in the following manner.

Concerning the Nazarenes.

1. They maintained the perpetual obligation of the law of Moſes, and differed only from the Jews, in that they profeſſed the name of Chriſt, and urged, as neceſſary, the uſe of ſacrifices, circumciſion, &c. [f]

2. They denied the Divinity of Chriſt, aſſerting him

Concerning the Ebionites.

1. They obliged themſelves to the obſervation of all things commanded in the law of Moſes, ſuch as ſacrifices, circumciſion, &c. profeſſed enemies to St. Paul and his writings, becauſe he wrote ſo warmly againſt the law [g].

2. They all looked upon Chriſt as a mere creature;

[a] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 26.
[b] Eccl. Hiſt. l. 3. c. 27.
[c] This would probably admit no doubt, if more of it had been preſerved.
[d] Hæreſ. 29. §. 7. See alſo Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. lib. 3. c. 5.
[e] Epiph. Hæreſ. 29. §. 1.
[f] Id. §. 7.
[g] Iren. adv. Hæreſ. lib. 1. c. 26. Euſeb. l. 3. c. 27. Epiph. Hær. 30. §. 1, 2.

to be a mere man; ſo we read in Theodoret, that they looked upon him only as a juſt and good man. Hær. Fab. l. ii. c. 2.[a]

ſome aſſerting him a mere man, born, as other men, of Joſeph and Mary[b]. Others confeſſed him to have come from Heaven, but made before all, and being a ſuperangelical Creature, had the dominion of all[c].

3. They uſed the Goſpel according to Matthew in the Hebrew, moſt entire, according to Epiphanius, who adds, that he was uncertain whether they had taken away out of it the genealogy from Abraham to Chriſt, or no[d].

3. They made uſe of St. Matthew's Goſpel alone[e], and that in Hebrew[f], *but according to Epiphanius*, not entire, but corrupted and adulterated[g], and took away the genealogy from it[h], and began their Goſpel with theſe words; *And it came to paſs in the days of Herod*[i], &c.

It is plain therefore, that there was a very great agreement between theſe two antient ſects; and though they went under different names, yet they ſeem only to differ in this, that the Ebionites had made ſome additions to the old Nazarene ſyſtem; for Origen expreſsly tells us[k], Καὶ Ἐβιωναῖοι χρηματίζουσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὡς Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι, *They were called Ebionites, who from among the Jews own Jeſus to be the Chriſt.* And though Epiphanius ſeems to make their Goſpels different, calling one πληρέστατον, moſt entire, the other ὐ πληρέστατον, not entire, yet this need not move us; for if the

[a] Epiphanius indeed was uncertain of it; but the matter cannot be queſtioned by any who read what he hath wrote. Hær. 29. §. 7, &c.
[b] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 3. c. 27. and Hær. 30. §. 2.
[c] Hær. 30. §. 3.
[d] Hæreſ. 29. §. 9.
[e] Iren. adv. Hæreſ. lib. 1. c. 26.
[f] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 3. c. 27.
[g] Hæreſ. 30. §. 13.
[h] Ibid.
[i] Ibid.
[k] Contr. Celſ. lib. 2. p. 56. See the ſame alſo Epiſt. Hier. ad Auguſtin. Vid. Spencer. Annotation. in loc. Orig. p. 33, 34.

learned

learned Caſaubon's conjecture ſhould not be right, *that we ſhould read the ſame*, viz. ὁ πληρέστατον, *in both places* [a] (which yet is very probable for any thing Father Simon has proved to the contrary): yet will the difficulty be all removed at once by this ſingle conſideration, *that Epiphanius never ſaw any Goſpel of the Nazarenes*; for though he calls it πληρέστατον, yet he himſelf ſays, ἐκ οἶδα δὲ εἰ καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας περιεῖλον [b], *that he did not know whether they had taken away the genealogy as the Ebionites had done*, i. e. having never ſeen the Nazarene Goſpel, for ought he knew, it might be the very ſame with that of the Ebionites, as indeed it moſt certainly was.

CHAP. XXX.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla extant in the Bodleian Library, and publiſhed by Dr. Grabe. Acts of Paul a different Book. Theſe falſely ſuppoſed by Dr. Mill to be wrote by faithful Chriſtians, A. D. LXIX. to ſupply the Defects of Luke's Hiſtory of the Apoſtles' Acts. A ſilly Forgery rejected by all the Antients who name it. The Preaching of Paul and Peter one Book. A Book under the Name of Paul. The Anabaticon or Revelation of Paul generally thought to have been two Books. A ridiculous Blunder of Mr. Toland's, relating to it. Proved by ſeveral Arguments to be only different Titles of the ſame Book. A Conjecture concerning a Paſſage of Tertullian, wherein he refers to this Book. The Title of a Revelation under the Name of Paul now extant in a Manuſcript in the Library of Merton College at Oxford.

Numb. XLIII. The ACTS of PAUL and THECLA.

THESE are mentioned by Tertullian, and from him by Jerome, and afterwards by Gelaſius.

[a] See this conjecture in his Exercitations againſt Baronius, ad Ann. Chriſti XXXIV. N. 165. p. 486. It is rejected by Simon, Critic. Hiſt. of the New Teſt. par. 1. c. 7. p. 65. Fabrit. Cod. Apoc. N. T. par. i. p. 369.

[b] Hæreſ. 29. in fine.

1. Tertullian[a], in his Treatise of Baptism, mentions it thus.

Quod si qui Pauli perperam scripta legunt, exemplum Theclæ ad licentiam mulierum docendi tingendique defendunt, sciant in Asia presbyterum qui eam Scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum, atque confessum, id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco discessisse.

But if any read the Apocryphal Books of Paul, and defend the right of women to preach and baptise, by the *example of Thecla*, let them consider, that a Presbyter of Asia, who forged that book, and adorned his performance with *the title of Paul*, was convicted (of the forgery), and confessed that he did it out of respect to Paul, and thereupon left his place.

2. Jerome, in his Life of Luke[b].

Periodos Pauli et Theclæ, et totam baptisati leonis fabulam, inter Apocryphas Scripturas computamus. Quale enim est, ut individuus comes Apostoli inter cæteras ejus res hoc solum ignoraverit? Sed et Tertullianus, vicinus eorum temporum, refert Presbyterum quendam in Asia, φιλόπαυλον, i. e. amatorem Pauli, convictum apud Joannem quod auctor esset libri, et confessum se hoc Pauli amore fecisse, et loco excidisse.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla, and the whole story of the baptised lion, I reckon among the Apocryphal Scriptures; for what sort of thing must it be, which the constant companion of the Apostle should be ignorant of, and no other thing which he did? But Tertullian, who lived near those times, relates, that a certain Presbyter of Asia, an admirer of Paul, being convicted by St. John, that he was the author of the book, confessed that he did it out of love to Paul, and so left his place.

[a] Cap. 17.

[b] Catal. vir. illust. in Luca.

3. Gelasius,

3. Gelaſius, in his decree.

Liber, qui appellatur Actus Theclæ et Pauli, Apocryphus.	The Book, which is called *The Acts of Thecla and Paul*, is Apocryphal [a].

I need not be at much pains here in making any critical remarks on this book. The learned Dr. Grabe has lately publiſhed, out of a manuſcript in the Bodleian library, a book intitled, Μαρτύριον τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἐνδόξου πρωτομάρτυρος, καὶ ἀποστόλου Θέκλας, *The Martyrology, or Acts of the pious and celebrated firſt Martyr, and Apoſtle Thecla* [b]. This he believes [c] to be the very ſame with the Acts of Paul and Thecla, mentioned by Tertullian, Jerome, and Gelaſius; and indeed there is this good argument to ſupport his opinion, that what Tertullian ſaith was urged out of theſe Acts, viz. *the example of Thecla, to countenance the practice of women's preaching and baptiſing, is to be found in this manuſcript which he has publiſhed*; ſee p. 114, 116, &c. I muſt therefore look upon this as a book extant, and ſo ſhall defer the conſideration of it to the next volume of this work, where I deſign (God willing) to produce this and other ſuch pieces now extant, in their original languages, with an Engliſh tranſlation.

Numb. XLIV. The ACTS of PAUL.

CONcerning this old Apocryphal piece, we have but very little that is certain now left. It is mentioned;

1. By Origen, giving a deſcription of Chriſt [d].

Unde et recte mihi dictus videtur ſermo ille, qui in Acti-	Wherefore that ſaying ſeems to me right, which is written

[a] Mr. Toland (Amyntor. p. 30.) has the goodneſs to refer us to a place in St. Auſtin, and another in Epiphanius, where theſe Acts are mentioned: but I muſt do him the juſtice to tell him, there is no ſuch book mentioned in either place.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. I. t. 1. p. 95.

[c] Ibid. p. 90, 95.

[d] Lib. 1. Περὶ ἀρχῶν, parum ab initio, cap. 2.

bus

bus Pauli ſcriptus eſt, Quia hic eſt Verbum, animal vivens.

in the Acts of Paul, That this is the Word, a living animal.

2. By the ſame [a].

Εἰ τῷ δὲ φίλον παραδέξασθαι τὸ ἐν ταῖς Παύλε πράξεσιν ἀναγεγραμμένον ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἰρημένον, Ἄνωθεν μέλλω σταυροῦσθαι.

But if any one pleaſe to admit that which is written in *the Acts of Paul*, as ſpoken by our Saviour, *I am about to be crucified again.*

3. By Euſebius [b].

Οὐδὲ μὴν τὰς λεγομένας αὐτῆς πράξεις ἐν ἀναμφιλέκτοις παρείληφα.

As for that book, which is intitled *The Acts of Paul*, I have not found it among thoſe of undoubted authority.

4. By the ſame [c].

Ἐν τοῖς νόθοις καταταχθήτω καὶ τῶν Παύλε πράξεων ἡ γραφὴ, &c.

The Acts of Paul are to be ranked among thoſe books which are ſpurious.

5. By Philaſtrius [d].

Habent Manichæi——Actus Pauli pariter Apocryphi, &c.

The Manichees have alſo *the Acts of Paul*, which are Apocryphal.

Theſe are the ſeveral places where theſe Acts are mentioned. I readily agree with Dr. Grabe [e], *they were not the ſame with the* Acts of Paul and Thecla *in the laſt number*; but muſt utterly diſſent from him in ſaying, that *Euſebius places it in the catalogue of books which were doubted of only by ſome*: whereas nothing can be more plain, than that he ranks it with the νόθοις, or ſpurious books; which are in the worſt claſs.

[a] Tom. 21. in Joann. pag. 298.
[b] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.
[c] C. 25.
[d] Hæreſ. Apocrypha quæ eſt 87.
See it above in this part, Chap. XXI.
[e] Lib. cit. p. 86.

Nor

Nor is it leſs abſurd in Dr. Mill [a] to ſuppoſe, *that theſe* Acts of Paul *were compiled by ſome faithful Chriſtians about the year of Chriſt LXIX. to ſupply (as he calls it)* imperfectam hiſtoriam Pauli quam tradiderat Lucas, i. e. *thoſe imperfect accounts which are contained in the* (now received) *Acts of the Apoſtles which were written by Luke.* For beſides that he offers no manner of argument for his hypotheſis, it is ſufficient to deſtroy it, that *Euſebius reckons it among the ſpurious books, and Philaſtrius among thoſe ſilly books, which contained abundance of ſtrange ſtories, about dogs and beaſts ſpeaking*, &c. *and for that reaſon, that the ſouls of men were like the ſouls of thoſe animals.* Although I cannot but here own, that perhaps Philaſtrius may ſpeak of thoſe Acts of Paul which are mentioned by Photius [b], and attributed to Leucius Charinus by him.

As to the two paſſages taken out of theſe Acts by Origen, it is plain he appeals to them, and the book whence he takes them, not as being of authority. Accordingly he introduces them thus: *The ſaying ſeems to me right*, and *if any one pleaſe to admit that which is written in the Acts of Paul*, &c. which are forms of ſpeech he would never have uſed concerning any book, which he thought to be of undoubted authority. Beſides, to ſay nothing of the firſt of thoſe paſſages, which is moſt obſcure and unintelligible, to ſay no worſe, viz. *That he is the Word, a living Animal*; the latter is borrowed from a moſt ridiculous hiſtory, which is ſtill extant in the fabulous *Lives of the Apoſtles under the name of Abdias* (viz. in the Life of Peter, c. 19.) The ſtory in ſhort is, "*That after the* "*decree of Nero to apprehend Peter at Rome, he was at length* "*prevailed upon by his friends, contrary to his own inclina-* "*tions, to endeavour his eſcape; accordingly having in the* "*night fled as far as the city gates, he ſaw Chriſt coming to* "*meet him: to whom he ſaid, Lord! Whither art thou going?* "*Chriſt anſwered, I come to Rome to be crucified again* (which

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 330.

[b] Cod. CXIV. See the place at large above, Chap. XXI.

"are

" are the words of the paſſage in Origen): *Peter underſtood* " *this as an intimation that he ought to ſuffer, and thereupon* " *returned, and was crucified.*"

Upon the whole, then, it is reaſonable to conclude theſe Acts of Paul Apocryphal, by Prop. IV, V, VI, and IX; and therefore that Mr. Whiſton is much miſtaken, when he ſays it is to be looked upon in ſome ſenſe as a ſacred book [a].

Numb. XLV. The Preaching of PAUL and PETER.

THIS antient Apocryphal book appears very clearly to have been the ſame with that intitled, *The Preaching of Peter*; not only from ſome paſſages in Clemens Alexandrinus, but from the account which Lactantius [b] gives of it. *Peter and Paul*, ſays he, *preached at Rome, and that preaching continues ſtill, being committed to writing*: but though it went under both the name of Paul and Peter, yet it generally was called by the name of Peter; and therefore I ſhall defer the conſideration of it, till I come to conſider the books under his name in the enſuing chapters. See Chap. XXXIII. Numb. LII.

Numb. XLVI. A BOOK under the NAME of PAUL.

AS for this book, although I indeed placed it in the catalogue, Part I. yet upon an after and more careful enquiry into it, I find it ſo evident, *that it was a book forged by one Lucian, a Confeſſor, in the middle of the third century, in the name of Paul the Martyr, and not St. Paul the Apoſtle*, as ſome have thought, that I ſhall think it enough to refer the reader to the places in Cyprian where this is moſt manifeſt. See Epiſt. 22, 23, in the beginning of each.

[a] Eſſay on Conſtit. p. 24. [b] Lib. 4. c. 21.

Numb.

Numb. XLVII. The REVELATION, or ANABATICON of PAUL.

I HAVE given this book theſe two different titles, becauſe I find it went under both among the antients; though it has been thought by ſeveral learned men, that they were the titles of two different books. How true this is, I ſhall enquire, after I have firſt produced the places where it is mentioned by the antients. Theſe are,

1. Epiphanius [a], who gives us the following account of it: ſpeaking concerning the *ridiculous ſect of the Caianites* [b], and an abſurd book of their tenets, adds;

Πάλιν δὲ ἄλλο συνταγμάτιον πλάτ|ουσιν ἐξ ὀνόματος Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἀῤῥητουργίας ἔμπλεον, ᾧ καὶ οἱ Γνωστικοὶ λεγόμενοι χρῶνται, ὃ Ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου καλοῦσι, τὴν πρόφασιν εὑρόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ λέγειν τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀναβεβηκέναι ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἀκηκοέναι ἄῤῥητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἔξον ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. Καὶ ταῦτα, φασὶν, ἐστὶ τὰ ἄῤῥητα ῥήματα.

That they forged beſides *another book, under the name of Paul the Apoſtle*, full of things which it was not lawful to utter; which they who are called *the Gnoſticks* alſo uſe, which they intitle *The Anabaticon of Paul*; taking the occaſion (of the forgery) from that ſaying of the Apoſtle, that *he aſcended up into the third heaven, and heard things which it was not lawful for men to utter.* And theſe, ſay they, are the things.

2. Auſtin [c], ſpeaking of the different attainments of ſome good men in knowledge, adds;

Quidam ſpiritualium ad ea pervenerunt, quæ non licet homini loqui; qua occaſione

Some Chriſtians arrived to the knowledge of thoſe things which cannot be uttered: on

[a] Hæreſ. 38. §. 2.

[b] Concerning theſe monſtrous hereticks, ſee above, Chap. XX. Numb. XXVIII.

[c] Tractat. xcviii. in Joan. in ipſo extremo. T. Opp. 9.

vani

vani quidam Apocalypſin Pauli, quam ſana non recipit eccleſia, neſcio quibus fabulis plenam ſtultiſſima præſumptione finxerunt, dicentes hanc eſſe unde dixerat raptum ſe fuiſſe in tertium cœlum, et illic audiſſe ineffabilia verba, quæ non licet homini loqui. Utcunque illorum tolerabilis eſſet audacia, ſi ſe audiſſe dixiſſet, quæ adhuc non licet homini loqui; cum vero dixerit quæ non licet homini loqui; iſti qui ſunt, qui hæc audeant impudenter et infeliciter loqui?

which occaſion ſome vain perſons, with a moſt ridiculous impudence, forged (a book intitled) *The Revelation of Paul*, which the true Church doth not receive; it being filled with I know not what ſort of ſtrange ſtories; pretending that it was on account of the things contained in this book, that he ſaid *he was taken up into the third heavens, and there heard unutterable words, which it was not lawful for a man to ſpeak.* Their impudence had indeed been tolerable, if he had ſaid that he heard things which it was not lawful *as yet* for a man to utter; but ſince he ſpeaks (abſolutely) of things which it was not lawful *at all* to utter, what ſtrange ſort of perſons muſt they be, who would thus impudently blunder?

3. Gelaſius, in his Decree.

Revelatio, quæ appellatur Pauli Apoſtoli Apocrypha.

The Revelation under the name of Paul the Apoſtle, is Apocryphal.

Theſe are all the places within my limited time, in which this book is mentioned; *though it was in being ſome ages after*, as I ſhall ſhew preſently. I have joined theſe places together, as ſuppoſing *the Anabaticon of Paul* mentioned by Epiphanius, and *the Revelation of Paul* mentioned by Auſtin and Pope Gelaſius, *to be only one and the ſame book*, under two different (and indeed ſcarce different) titles. I confeſs, moſt

of

of the learned writers that I have ſeen, who have mentioned any thing of this matter, ſuppoſe them to have been two different books. Thus Dr. Cave, enumerating the ſpurious pieces fathered upon St. Paul [a], firſt recites the Anabaticon mentioned by Epiphanius, and then, as diſtinct from it, the Revelation mentioned by Auſtin: ſo Du Pin alſo recites them diſtinctly [b], though in a note at the bottom of the page he ſeems to think they were the ſame. Dr. Grabe [c] not only ſuppoſes them *different books*, but made *at very different times*, viz. *the Anabaticon in the ſecond century, and the Revelation in the latter end of the fourth*, between the years 396 and 392. Mr. Spanheim [d] alſo, and Father Simon [e], recite them as *two different books*. So alſo (as one would imagine) after theſe does Mr. Toland, to augment his catalogue [f]; but nothing can be more humorous than to obſerve his blunder herein. He *firſt places the Revelation of Paul*, and refers to Epiphanius, Hæreſ. 38. §. 2. which is the place where he mentions the Anabaticon, and then *in the next page recites the Anabaticon of St. Paul*, and refers to the ſame place of Epiphanius (viz. Hæreſ. 38. §. 2.); which is, as if he had ſaid, *The Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul are two diſtinct books, and they are ſo, becauſe Epiphanius mentions but one.* Such miſtakes, ſo frequent, are, to ſay no worſe, unbecoming any man that pretends to learning. I deſire Mr. Toland to be more careful and honeſt in the future attacks he threatens to make upon the Canon. But to leave him. Mr. Fabritius [g], following Dr. Grabe, ſuppoſes the Revelation and Anabaticon books of two different ſubjects, viz. *the latter containing the fancies of the Gnoſticks, and the former made not till the end of the fourth century by ſome Chriſtian monks, containing the rules of their way of life.*

Notwithſtanding this ſo great agreement of learned writers in this matter, I think the contrary opinion moſt undeniable,

[a] Hiſtor. Liter. in Paulo, p. 7.
[b] Hiſt. of the Canon, Vol. II. Chap. VI. §. 6. p. 129, 130.
[c] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. I. p. 84, 85.
[d] Hiſtor. Chriſt. Secul. I. p. 58.
[e] Crit. Hiſt. of New Teſt. c. 3. p. 26.
[f] Amyntor. p. 32.
[g] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſtam. par. 2. p. 945.

viz.

viz. that the Anabaticon of Paul mentioned by Epiphanius, and the Revelation mentioned by Auſtin and Gelaſius, were one and the ſame book. And this I argue,

Firſt, From the conſideration that the *deſign, occaſion of writing*, as well as *the main ſubject of the Anabaticon and the Revelation were the ſame.* This will appear by a compariſon of Epiphanius and Auſtin together [a].

Epiphanius concerning the Anabaticon of Paul.	*St. Auſtin concerning the* Revelation of Paul.
The occaſion of this forgery was St. Paul's ſaying, *He aſcended into the third heavens, and heard things which it was not lawful to utter.*	The occaſion of this Revelation was, that ſome Chriſtians had arrived to the knowledge of things which it was not lawful to utter. That he means Paul, is plain by what follows.
The contents of this book were the unutterable things which Paul heard in the third heavens. καὶ ταῦτα, φασὶν, &c.	This book pretended to give an account of thoſe things which St. Paul heard, and ſaid, were unutterable.

Theſe muſt be the contents of the ſame book; agreeable to which,

Secondly, *The titles Anabaticon and Apocalypſis were both adjuſted*; the former denoting *Paul's aſcent and the viſions he had in the third heavens*; or, as Mr. Du Pin's Engliſh tranſlator renders it, *The rapture of Paul:* the latter denoting the *viſions or revelations, as in that book diſcovered.* So that if we were to tranſlate theſe two titles into Engliſh, one might not unjuſtly do it thus: *The Hiſtory of St. Paul's Aſcent into the third Heavens*; or, *An Account of the Viſions and Revelations which he had there.*

This may ſuffice to prove theſe only two different titles of

[a] See the places above in this Chapter.

one

one book; which difference is very well conjectured [a] by Dr. Mill *to have happened when this book was afterwards tranſlated into Latin.*

All that is urged to prove them diſtinct books is by Dr. Grabe and Mr. Fabritius [b], viz. that the Revelation is *not mentioned till St. Auſtin, and therefore probably was not made before his time, whereas the Anabaticon was made by the Caianites, in the ſecond century*; and whereas the former *contained the principles of the Gnoſticks*, the latter *contained the rules of the Monaſtick life.* But both theſe objections are founded upon the moſt precarious foundation: for as to the firſt, viz. *the books not being mentioned before*, it is a plain begging of the queſtion; firſt ſuppoſing them two diſtinct books, and then proving they are ſo by that ſuppoſition. Beſides, if the ſilence of the writers of the age, in or after which any book be ſuppoſed to be made, be a good argument that it was not then made, then muſt a great number of books be brought many years back; and particularly what will become of the antiquity of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, and the Goſpel of the Egyptians? which, though Dr. Grabe ſuppoſes to be written before St. Luke's Goſpel, are not either of them mentioned by name till near three hundred years after Chriſt. As to the latter, viz. *the Monks uſing it, and being delighted with it*, it is much weaker than the former. The argument ſtands fairly thus: the Monks of the fourth century were much delighted with the Revelation of Paul, therefore it was made then: they uſed it, therefore they forged it. Sozomen indeed relates a fabulous account of this Revelation *being found in the time of Theodoſius the Emperor, in a marble cheſt, hid under ground at the houſe of St. Paul, at Tarſus in Cilicia, to which they were directed by God*; but he adds, *that he was aſſured by a Preſbyter of Tarſus, who was very old, that this was not fact; but he ſuppoſed the book forged by the Hereticks.* He farther ſays, *it was a book much commended by the Monks* [c]; but

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 364.

[b] Locis ſupra allegatis in hoc Capite.

[c] Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. vii. c. 19.

there is nothing in this ſtory that will prove it a forgery of that time; for the book may be ſuppoſed extant long before, but by this artifice of the Monks impoſed upon the world, as more valuable and extraordinary.

The Anabaticon therefore, and the Revelation of Paul, being one and the ſame book, it only remains now, that I endeavour to prove it Apocryphal: and that it is ſo, is evident by Prop. IV, V, and VI. I add alſo, by Prop. VIII, as the whole deſign of it was contrary to a known and undoubted fact. 2 Cor. xii. 4, &c. St. Paul there ſays, *he heard unutterable words* (ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι) *which it was not in the power of any man to declare:* which if it be true (as the book itſelf ſuppoſes), then they attempted in writing what was utterly impoſſible to be wrote, and ſo unhappily blundered, as that the whole deſign of their work was a mere contradiction to the title. (See Auſtin above.)

Tertullian[a] has a paſſage in his *Book againſt the Hereticks*, which (if my judgment do not much fail me) may be very juſtly applied to this *Revelation of Paul*; and if it may, will afford a good argument to prove it Apocryphal. He is treating concerning the harmony of the Apoſtles' doctrines; and then adds[b],

Sed et ſi in tertium uſque cœlum ereptus Paulus, et in Paradiſum delatus, audiit quædam illic; non poſſunt videri ea fuiſſe, quæ illum in aliam doctrinam inſtructiorem præſtarent; cum ita fuerit conditio eorum, ut nulli hominum proderentur. Quod ſi ad alicujus conſcientiam manavit neſcio quid illud, et hoc ſe

Yea, and though Paul was taken up to the third heavens, and being brought into Paradiſe, heard ſome certain things there, they cannot be thought ſuch, as would make him capable of preaching any new doctrines; ſeeing they were of that ſort, that they could not be revealed or communicated to any man. *But if any one imagine he have the knowledge of theſe ſtrange re-*

[a] De Præſcript. adv. Hæret. c. 24.

[b] Loc. cit.

aliqua

aliqua hæreſis ſequi affirmat, aut Paulus ſecreti proditi reus eſt, aut et alius poſtea in Paradiſum ereptus debet oſtendi, cui permiſſum ſit eloqui quæ Paulo mutire non licuit.

velations, and there be any ſort of Hereticks, who declare they will be governed by them, (let them conſider), that either Paul muſt have been guilty of betraying the ſecret committed to him, or elſe they muſt produce ſome other perſon, who has ſince been taken up to Paradiſe, who had permiſſion to ſpeak thoſe things freely, of which St. Paul durſt not utter a word.

Nothing can be more probable, than that theſe words have a reference to the written Revelations we are treating of. It is certain by the paſſage, that there were ſome who pretended to know what St. Paul ſaw in the third heavens, and that there were a peculiar ſort of Hereticks, who governed themſelves according to them. How little different this is from what Epiphanius above ſays of the Gnoſticks and Caianites, every unprejudiced reader will acknowledge, who compares the places. In this interpretation I have the ſatisfaction to agree with Pamelius [a], who remarks on theſe words of Tertullian thus: *You ſee there have been ſome who affirmed they both knew and read in a writing of St. Paul's own, the ſecrets he heard in Heaven; affirming that he both preached them, and committed them to writing.* This learned writer afterwards cites the place of Epiphanius concerning the Anabaticon, that of Auſtin and Gelaſius concerning the Revelation, as all ſpeaking of one and the ſame book.

Upon the whole then, it is evident it was a ſpurious piece; and that as neither Paul did nor could write it, ſo neither could any one elſe give any true account of what that book pretended to. I only add, that Dionyſius Alexandrinus, a noted writer early in the third century, aſſures us [b], Παῖλε διὰ τῶν

[a] Annot. in Loc. Tertull.

[b] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. vii. c. 25.

ἐπιστολῶν ὑποφήναντός τι καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐκ ἐνέγραψε καθ' αὑτές. That *though Paul in his Epiſtles has made ſome mention of his Revelations, yet he never committed them to writing*; and that as Mr. Du Pin ſays, the *Egyptians boaſt of having this Revelation by them to this very day*[a]: ſo Dr. Grabe[b] tells us of a *manuſcript in the library of Merton College in Oxford*, intitled thus, *The Revelation of Paul*, (cŏntaining what paſſed) *in thoſe three days; when upon his being called and converted by Chriſt, he fell upon the ground, and ſaw nothing; being an account of the Revelations he had from St. Michael, concerning the various and dreadful puniſhments of purgatory and hell, and who it was that firſt prevailed upon the Lord to grant reſt to the ſouls in purgatory on every Lord's day afterwards, to the end of the world.* But neither of theſe were the old Revelation, of which I have been treating, but much later forgeries.

CHAP. XXXI.

The Acts of Peter; or, The Travels of Peter, and the Recognitions of Clemens, differing Titles of the ſame Book now extant. The Preaching and Doctrine of Peter the ſame Book. The Goſpel of Peter. Mark's Goſpel formerly aſcribed to Peter; and the Reaſons of it. Peter's Goſpel not compoſed by Leucius, as Dr. Grabe and Dr. Mill ſuppoſe, but a Forgery of the Hereticks called Docetæ, and perhaps the ſame as the Goſpel of Baſilides. This proved probable by ſeveral Arguments.

Numb. XLVIII. The ACTS of PETER.

UNDER the name of this Apoſtle I find mention among the antients of ſeveral ſpurious pieces; and particularly by ſeveral of certain Acts; viz.

[a] Hiſt. of the Canon, Vol. II. c. 6. §. 6. p. 130.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 85.

1. By

1. By Euſebius[a].

Τόγε μὴν τῶν ἐπικεκλημένων Πέτρε πράξεων——ἀδ' ὅλως ἐν τοῖς καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένον· ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῆ συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις.

It is certain, that the book intitled, *The Acts of Peter*—— is not by any means to be reckoned among the Canonical books; inaſmuch as none of the antients, nor any of our Eccleſiaſtical writers, have taken teſtimonies out of it.

2. By Athanaſius[b].

Τὰ τῆς νέας διαθήκης ἀντιλεγόμενα ταῦτα, περίοδοι Πέτρε——παραγεγραμμένα εἰσὶ πάνυ καὶ νόθα καὶ ἀπόκρυφα, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῶν ἀποκρύφων μᾶλλον ἔγκριτον ἢ ἐπωφελὲς, ἐξαιρέτως τῆς νέας διαθήκης· ἀλλὰ πάντα δίχα τῶν ἀνωτέρω διαληφθέντων καὶ ἐγκριθέντων παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς σοφοῖς, ἀποκρυφῆς μᾶλλον ἢ ἀναγνώσεως ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄξια, τά τε ἄλλα, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ καλούμενα ἐν αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγέλια, ἐκτὸς τῶν παραδοθέντων ἡμῖν τεσσάρων τούτων.

The Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament are theſe, *The Acts* (or *Journeys) of Peter*, &c.——They are all falſe, ſpurious, and to be rejected; none of thoſe Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament have been either approved, or are uſeful, but they have all been judged Apocryphal, i. e. rather to be concealed than read, by the antient wiſe men and Fathers, which contain any thing contrary to the books above recited[c]; as alſo all other Goſpels beſides thoſe four delivered to us.

3. By Jerome[d] in the Life of Peter.

Libri autem ejus, e quibus unus Actorum ejus inſcribitur, alius Evangelii, tertius

But thoſe (other) books (called) Peter's, among which one is *His Acts*, another his

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 3.
[b] In Synopſ. verſus fin.
[c] He alludes to his catalogue of the Canonical books, which he had before given.
[d] Catal. vir. illuſtr. in Petro.

Prædicationis, quartus Apocalypseos, quintus Judicii, inter Apocryphas Scripturas reputantur.

Gospel, a third his Preaching, a fourth his Revelation, a fifth his Judgment, are reckoned among the Apocryphal Scriptures.

4. By Epiphanius [a], concerning the Ebionites.

Χρῶνται δὲ καὶ ἄλλαις τισὶ βίβλοις, ὅθεν ταῖς περιόδοις καλουμέναις Πέτρου, ταῖς διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφείσαις, νοθεύσαντες μὲν τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς, ὀλίγα δὲ ἀληθινὰ εἰδότες.

They make use of some other books, such as those called *The Acts* (or *Journeys*) *of Peter*, wrote by Clemens, in which they have left very little that is true, but inserted many spurious accounts.

5. By Gelasius, in his Decree.

Itinerarium nomine Petri Apostoli, quod appellatur sancti Clementis libri octo *(alii decem)* Apocryphum.

The Journeys under the name of Peter the Apostle, which are called *The eight* (other copies read *ten*) *Books of Clemens*, are Apocryphal.

6. By the same, a little after.

Actus nomine Petri Apostoli Apocryphi.

The Acts under the name of Peter the Apostle are Apocryphal.

Concerning these *Acts of Peter* it seems very hard to form any certain determination: I have here recited the testimonies of the *Acts and Periods*, or *Travels of Peter*, together, as *of one book*. The latter title undoubtedly belongs to that book now extant, called, *The Recognitions of Clement*; and whether the former also did not, I confess I cannot tell. For though Gelasius does indeed mention them as distinct, yet it is observable, that in the first editions of that *Pope's Decree* there was no such distinction, nor any mention at all of the *Acts of Peter*. Dr. Grabe [b] supposes them to have been dif-

[a] Hæres. 30. §. 15.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 78.

ferent

ferent books, not only becauſe of this paſſage of Gelaſius, but becauſe the *Periods* or *Travels* never went under the name of Peter, but Clemens; whereas the *Acts* always did. But in this he is miſtaken, the *Travels* being as expreſsly attributed to Peter, in the place now cited of Athanaſius, as the *Acts* can be any where elſe; ſo that, for ought I am able yet to ſee to the contrary, *theſe Acts of Peter*, and *the Travels of Peter*, written by Clemens, were the ſame book; and ſo being now extant, do not fall any farther under conſideration here, but muſt be referred to their proper place in the next volume.

Numb. XLIX. The DOCTRINE of PETER.

THIS has been clearly proved by Dr. Cave[a] and Dr. Grabe[b], to be the ſame book with that intitled, *The Preaching of Peter*; and therefore ſhall be conſidered there, Numb. LII. and the place of Origen, where it is mentioned, produced.

Numb. L. The GOSPEL of PETER.

THIS Apocryphal Goſpel has been taken notice of by many of the antient writers, whoſe accounts I ſhall produce, according to my uſual method; i. e. the time in which they lived. It is mentioned,

1. By Serapion, *in a treatiſe which he wrote concerning this Goſpel of Peter*; of which we have the following account preſerved by Euſebius[c].

[d]Ἕτερός τε συντεταγμένος αὐτῷ λόγος περὶ τῆς λεγομένης κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίου, ὃν πεποίηται ἀπελέγχων τὰ ψευδῶς ἐν αὐτῷ εἰρημένα, διά τι-

There is another treatiſe of his, which he wrote concerning the *Goſpel*, intitled, *according to Peter*, with deſign to confute ſome falſe aſſertions in it, on account of

[a] Hiſt. Liter. in Petro, p. 5.
[b] Lib. jam cit. tom. 1. p. 56.
[c] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 12.

νας ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ῥωσσὸν παροικίᾳ, προφάσει τῆς εἰρημένης γραφῆς εἰς ἑτεροδόξας διδασκαλίας ἀποκείλαντας. Ἀφ' ἧς εὔλογον ἔραχείας παραθέσθαι λέξεις, δι' ὧν ἣν εἶχε περὶ τὰ βιβλία γνώμην προτίθησιν, ἅτω γράφων. Ἡμεῖς γὰρ, ἀδελφοὶ, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν. Τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. Ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμενος παρ' ὑμῖν, ὑπενόουν τὰς πάντας ὀρθῇ πίστει προσφέρεσθαι, καὶ μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὀνόματι Πέτρῳ Εὐαγγέλιον, εἶπον, ὅτι εἰ τοῦτό ἐστι μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν, ἀναγινωσκέσθω. Νῦν δὲ μαθὼν, ὅτι αἱρέσει τινὶ ὁ νοῦς αὐτῶν ἐνεφώλευεν, ἐκ τῶν λεχθέντων μοι, σπουδάσω πάλιν γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ὥστε, ἀδελφοὶ, προσδοκᾶτέ με ἐν τάχει. Ἡμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοὶ, καταλαβόμενοι ὁποίας ἦν αἱρέσεως ὁ Μαρκιανὸς, καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἠναντιοῦτο, μὴ νοῶν ἃ ἐλάλει,

some in the pariſh of Roſſus, who, through the occaſion of the ſaid Scripture, fell into ſome erroneous doctrines. It may not be improper to produce ſome few paſſages of it, in which he declares what his ſentiments were of that book. He writes thus: "We, brethren, do receive "Peter and the other Apoſ- "tles even as Chriſt; but "*the ſpurious pieces under* "*their names*, as well know- "ing them, *we reject, having* "*good evidence that we have* "*received no ſuch things.* For "when I was among you, I "ſuppoſed that all were be- "lievers of the true doc- "trine; and ſo not reading "over the book which they "brought me, under the title "of *the Goſpel of Peter*, I "ſaid, If this be the only oc- "caſion of your contention, "let the book be read. But "now perceiving, by what "I am told, *that they had* "*ſome ſecret hereſy in their* "*minds* (viz. which they had "a mind to ſupport by this "book), I will ſpeedily make "another viſit to you. But "we, brethren, know what "the hereſy of Marcianus is, "who is not conſiſtent with "himſelf, not underſtanding

λει,

λει, ἃ μαθήσεσθε ἐξ ὧν ὑμῖν ἐγράφη. Ἐδυνήθημεν γὰρ παρ' ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, τουτέστι παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων αὐτοῦ, οὓς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν (τὰ γὰρ πλείονα φρονήματα ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας) χρησάμενοι παρ' αὐτῶν διελθεῖν, καὶ εὑρεῖν τὰ μὲν πλείονα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου τοῦ Σωτῆρος, τινὰ δὲ παροσδιεσταλμένα, ἃ καὶ ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ Σεραπίωνος.

"what he ſaid, as you may "perceive by what has been "written to you. For we "prevailed over thoſe others, "who make uſe of this Goſ-"pel, i. e. over thoſe who "were his (viz. Marcia-"nus's) ſucceſſors, whom we "call Docetas (for they have "in their ſcheme of doctrine "a great variety of ſenti-"ments), and having bor-"rowed *(the ſaid Goſpel)* of "them to peruſe, found out "many things rightly ſpoken "of our Saviour, and others "as bad, which I have ſub-"joined to this Epiſtle." So far Serapion [a].

2. By Tertullian [b].

Evangelium, quod edidit Marcus, Petri adfirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus.

The Goſpel, which Mark publiſhed, *is affirmed by ſome to be* the Goſpel of Peter, *whoſe interpreter Mark was.*

3. By Origen [c].

Τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς Ἰησοῦ φασί τινες εἶναι ἐκ παραδόσεως ὁρμώμενοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίου, ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου, υἱοὺς Ἰωσὴφ ἐκ

There are ſome who ſay the brethren of Chriſt (here mentioned) were the children of Joſeph, by a former wife, who lived with him before Mary; and they are induced

[a] I imagine there is ſome defect in the Greek of Euſebius, in the latter part of this paragraph, not only becauſe the tranſlators Ruffin, Chriſtopherſon, and Valeſius prodigiouſly diſagree, but becauſe it is ſcarce capable of a juſt Verſion.

[b] Lib. 4. adv. Marcion. c. 5.

[c] Comment. in Matt. xiii. 55.

προτέρας

προτέρας γυναικὸς συνῳκηκυίας αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας.

to this opinion by some passages in that which is intitled, *The Gospel of Peter*, or the Book of James.

4. By Eusebius [a].

Τό τε μὲν—κατ' αὐτὸν ὠνομασμένον Εὐαγγέλιον——ἐδ' ὅλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένον, ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτοῦ συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις.

It is evident, that the book intitled, *The Gospel of Peter*,—is not by any means to be esteemed Canonical, inasmuch as none of the antients, nor any of our Ecclesiastical writers, have taken testimonies out of it.

By the same [b].

He places it *among the books forged by the Hereticks under the Apostles' names, not received nor cited by any Ecclesiastical writer, but to be rejected as impious and absurd.* See the place at large above, Chap. XXI. Numb. XXXIII.

5. By Jerome, in the Life of Peter [c].

Libri autem ejus, e quibus unus Actorum ejus inscribitur, alius Evangelii——inter Apocryphas Scripturas reputantur.

But those (other) books (called Peter's), among which one is his Acts, another his Gospel ——are reckoned *among the Apocryphal Scriptures.*

6. By the same [d], in the Life of Serapion.

Alium de Evangelio, quod sub Petri nomine fertur, librum composuit, ad Rhosensem Ciliciæ Ecclesiam, quæ in hæresin ex ejus lectione diverterat.

He composed also another book, concerning *the Gospel which is carried about under the name of Peter*, inscribed to the Church of Rossus in Cilicia, who by the reading of that book had fallen into heresy.

[a] Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.
[b] Id. l. 3. c. 25.
[c] Catal. vir. illustr. in Petro.
[d] Id. in Serap.

7. By

7. By Gelaſius, in his Decree, according to ſome editions.

Evangelia nomine Petri Apoſtoli Apocrypha.	The Goſpels under the name of Peter the Apoſtle are Apocryphal.

From theſe paſſages it is not difficult to come to a determination concerning this book; only it ſeems neceſſary firſt to obſerve, that though I have recited here the paſſage of Tertullian, in which the Goſpel of Mark appears formerly to have been called the Goſpel of Peter, yet it is by no means to be confounded with, or taken for the ſame with the Apocryphal book now under conſideration. I was obliged here to mention the paſſage of Tertullian, becauſe my deſign obliges me to produce every place where there is any ſuch mention; but it would be madneſs hence to infer, that theſe two books were the ſame, ſeeing all the writers, who mention this Goſpel of Peter, have rejected it as ſpurious, but every one of them agrée in the receiving of St. Mark's Goſpel as Canonical; which could never have happened, had they been the ſame book. But not to leave the reader, who is unacquainted with theſe things, in the dark, as to the *reaſon of Mark's Goſpel being called by the name of Peter*, I obſerve, that this was occaſioned *by the univerſally prevailing opinion among the firſt Chriſtians, that St. Mark, being the companion of Peter, wrote the Goſpel now extant under his name, from the mouth of Peter, or from what he heard him preach at Rome.* This is atteſted by Papias, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Jerome, and many others, as I have elſewhere obſerved, and endeavoured to prove their tradition to be true in this matter, from ſome internal evidences in the Goſpel. See my Vindication of St. Matthew's Goſpel, againſt Mr. Whiſton, Chap. VI. From all this it is plain, the *Goſpel of Peter*, now under diſcuſſion, was another book than that of St. Mark. By whom it was forged, is not very certain: Dr. Grabe [a], and after him Dr. Mill [b], ſuppoſe *it to have been made by Leucius*, whom

[a] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 58. §. 337.
[b] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam.

they

they reckon to have been a Heretick of the ſecond century: but in this they ſeem miſtaken, becauſe, as I have above proved, Chap. XXI. Leucius did not live till the latter end of the third, or beginning of the fourth century; whereas this Goſpel appears to have been extant in the ſecond century, by the book which Serapion wrote concerning it, who was biſhop of Antioch in the eleventh year of the Emperor Commodus, i. e. in the year of Chriſt 190, as is plain from the Chronicon of Euſebius, and Jerome's Account of his Life, above cited. That therefore which ſeems to me moſt probable, concerning the original of this book, is, that it was a compoſure of thoſe antient Hereticks, in the ſecond century, called *The Docetæ*, from δοκεῖν *to appear*, becauſe *they believed and taught that the ſufferings of Jeſus Chriſt were not real, but only in appearance*[a]. For of theſe Hereticks, Serapion ſays, he borrowed this book (if I rightly underſtand Euſebius), and in it he obſerved ſeveral erroneous notions concerning Chriſt, which no one can reaſonably doubt were theſe of Chriſt's not real, but apparent ſufferings, after reading the paſſage. Mr. Dodwell, though he interprets the Greek of Euſebius ſomewhat differently, nevertheleſs concludes the ſame from them, viz. that this Goſpel was forged by the Docetæ[b]; and if this be true, I would offer it here as a conjecture, *that perhaps the Goſpel of Baſilides, of which I have* above treated, Chap. XI. Numb. IX. *was the very ſame either in the whole, or in a great meaſure at leaſt, with this Apocryphal Goſpel under the name of Peter*; and this I am the rather inclined to believe,

Firſt, Becauſe *theſe Docetæ were a branch of the Gnoſticks*; and of theſe *Baſilides was the head and founder. Baſilides a quo Gnoſtici*, ſays Euſebius in his Chronicon ad Ann. Chriſti 136; i. e. from Baſilides proceeded the Gnoſticks.

Secondly, Becauſe *the Docetæ aroſe much about the ſame time that Baſilides and his opinions became known in the world.* The Docetæ, as appears from their being mentioned by Serapion, muſt at leaſt have been formed into a ſect before the

[a] Vid. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 3. p. 465. & lib. 7. p. 765.

[b] Dodwell. Diſſert. in Iren. IV. §. 35. p. 364.

end

end of the second century, and very probably before the middle of it; for Serapion disputed against those of this sect, who were (as he calls them) the διάδοχοι, *the successors* of Marcianus, who was one of these Docetæ. Now Serapion living, as has been above proved, in the year 190, and there having been *some successions* of these Hereticks between Marcianus and Serapion, it necessarily follows, that these Hereticks must have arose at least before the year 150, i. e. before the middle of this century. Besides, it is commonly supposed from those words of Clemens Alexandrinus [a], in which he calls Julius Cassianus ἐξάρχων τῆς Δοκήσεως, that *he was the first founder of these Docetæ*; and if so, it will follow that they were somewhat earlier; for then Marcianus must also have been one of his successors. I conclude, therefore, that these Docetæ arose very early in the second century, and consequently about the undoubted time in which Basilides and his tenets became most famous.

Thirdly, *Because Basilides and his disciples affirmed, that Christ was not really a man in flesh, but only appeared to be so; and accordingly was not really crucified, but, while he seemed to be so, another was crucified in his stead.* This appears by Irenæus and Epiphanius's account of this Heretick, in the places cited at the bottom of the page [b]. Now that these were also the principles of the Docetæ, is sufficiently evident; and even from their very name: from which so universal agreement, both in respect of time and tenets, I offer it as probable at least, that the Gospel of Basilides, and the Gospel of Peter, i. e. the Gospel of the Docetæ, *was one and the same book.*

Fourthly, To all this I add, that *Basilides's Gospel seems to have consisted of many tomes, or distinct books*; which probably are those twenty-four mentioned by Agrippa Castor (see above, Chap. XI. Numb. IX.): and accordingly in the Decree of Pope Gelasius, we find this Gospel under the name of Peter recited in the plural number, *Evangelia nomine Apostoli*

[a] Strom. lib. 3. p. 465.
[b] Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 1. c. 33. Epiphan. Hæres. 24.

Petri

Petri Apocrypha. The Goſpels (or various books of the Goſpel) *under the name of Peter, are Apocryphal.*

Whatever original be aſcribed to this book, we have the juſteſt reaſon to reject it as ſpurious and Apocryphal, by Prop. IV, V, VI, as alſo, if the foundation of the foregoing conjecture be juſt, by Prop. VIII. *as containing things certainly known to be falſe, and contrary to the whole deſign of Chriſtianity.* Nor need we at all be moved by what Dr. Mill [a], (who is ever too fond of the Apocryphal books, as was Dr. Grabe, whom he follows) urges, that this Goſpel was publickly read by the Chriſtians; there being no more foundation for this too raſh and unguarded aſſertion, than that Serapion, to prevent an uneaſineſs and contention in one particular Church, told the people, whom he imagined all well eſtabliſhed in the faith, that they might read the book; though himſelf afterwards, when he had peruſed it, declared againſt it, as an heretical book. Nor would it be at all more material to object, that Origen, in the paſſage above, has appealed to this book; for it is plain by the paſſage,

1. That *Origen himſelf never ſaw it*; for he does not himſelf cite it, only propoſes a hiſtory which *he had heard ſome others took out of it*, and knew not himſelf whether it was in this, or the book of James.

2. He himſelf did not credit either the book or the tradition taken out of it; hence he uſes the word δρμώμενοι, *to denote the raſhneſs of thoſe who regarded it.*

3. He ſeveral times declares, he only received the four Goſpels, which we now receive. See above, Chap. XXVIII.

Thus I have endeavoured to make the beſt enquiry I could into this Goſpel of Peter, which I ſhall now leave; only obſerving, how much too haſty Mr. Whiſton was, when he aſſerted this book *as probably in ſome ſenſe a ſacred book* [b].

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſt. §. 336. [b] Eſſay on the Conſtitutions, p. 24.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXII.

The Judgment of Peter. Dr. Cave's Opinion, that it was the same with the Shepherd of Hermas, confuted. Dr. Grabe's ingenious Conjecture, that it was the same with the Preaching of Peter, disproved. Dr. Mill's Opinion, that it was the same with the Revelation of Peter, refuted.

Numb. LI. The JUDGMENT of PETER.

OF this book we have not any mention till the latter end of the fourth century, by Jerome and Ruffin.

1. By Jerome [a], in his Life of Peter.

Libri autem ejus, e quibus unus Actorum ejus inscribitur, alius Evangelii, tertius Prædicationis, quartus Apocalypseos, quintus Judicii, inter Apocryphas Scripturas reputantur.

But those (other) books, called Peter's, among which one is his Acts, another his Gospel, a third his Preaching, a fourth his Revelation, a fifth *his Judgment*, are reputed among the Apocryphal Scriptures.

2. By Ruffin [b], in his Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. After an enumeration of the Canonical books.

Sciendum tamen est, quod et alii libri sunt, qui non Canonici, sed Ecclesiastici, a majoribus appellati sunt, ut est Sapientia Salomonis, — &c. In Novo vero Testamento libellus, qui dicitur Pastoris

It must be observed, that there are other books which were not called by our forefathers *Canonical*, but *Ecclesiastical*; such as *the Wisdom of Solomon*, &c. in the Old Testament. But in the New Testament, the little book which is called *The Shepherd*, or

[a] Catal. Vir. Illustr. in Petro. p. 575.
[b] Inter Opp. Cypriani, §. 36.

five

ſive Hermatis, qui appellatur Duæ Viæ, vel Judicium Petri; quæ legi quidem in Eccleſiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam.

Hermas; that which is called *The Two Ways*, or *The Judgment of Peter*, which they would have to be read in the Churches, but not to be urged as of any authority in confirming matters of faith.

There being nothing more ſaid of this book, it requires but little pains to prove it Apocryphal: it appears manifeſtly to have been ſuch by Prop. IV. and V; and though *ſome would have it read in the Churches*, as Ruffin ſays, *yet it was never judged of Canonical authority*, as he expreſsly tells us, but only read as an Eccleſiaſtical book, i. e. as the Apocrypha of the Old Teſtament and the Homilies are appointed to be read in England now; and ſo may very well be judged Apocryphal alſo by Prop. VI.

Among later writers, I have not met with any thing ſaid of this book, only that our three learned Doctors in England (whom I have ſo often mentioned in the preceding Chapters) have formed three ſeveral and very diſtinct judgments concerning this book; neither of which ſeems to have any great appearance of truth. Dr. Cave[a] underſtands Ruffin, as *making it the ſame with the* Shepherd of Hermas. Dr. Grabe[b] ſuppoſes it *the ſame with the* Preaching of Peter, and Dr. Mill[c] *the ſame with the* Revelation of Peter; from either of which it was certainly a diſtinct book.

1. As to Dr. Cave's opinion, though I confeſs it was very eaſy for any one to fall into it, it plainly appears to have been founded *on a too careleſs reading of Ruffin's words. Libellus, qui dicitur Paſtoris ſive Hermatis, qui appellatur Duæ Viæ, vel Judicium Petri, quæ legi quidem in Eccleſiis voluerunt*, &c. which according to him muſt be pointed and tranſlated thus: The little book which is called, The *Shepherd* or *Hermas, which is called* the *Two Ways*, or *the Judgment of Peter*; as though theſe were only ſeveral titles of the ſame book.

[a] Hiſt. Liter. in Petro, p. 5.
[b] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. I. p. 56.
[c] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 136.

But

But the Doctor did not conſider, that the *relative particle qui*, where it occurs in the ſecond place, requires the *ſubſtantive libellus*, meaning a diſtinct book, to be before it as well as in the firſt place; and that if it did not, either it and the word *appellatur* muſt be both *quite uſeleſs*, or elſe there muſt have been an *etiam*, or ſome ſuch particle inſerted: ſo that inſtead of tranſlating it, as he would have it, *The book which is called* the Shepherd *or* Hermas, *which is called* the Two Ways, *&c.* which every one muſt ſee to be an abſurd way of ſpeaking; it is very naturally, and according to plain conſtruction, to be tranſlated thus, *The book which is called* the Shepherd *or* Hermas, *that (book) which is called* the Two Ways, *&c.* Beſides, had Ruffin deſigned to have expreſſed the three titles of one book, he would have inſerted the particle *vel* before *Duæ Viæ*, as well as before *Judicium Petri*. To add no more of this, there is another queſtion moved by Pamelius [a], *Whether the words* Duæ Viæ *may not belong to* Judicium Petri, *as a different title of that book?* To which I only anſwer, that the particle *vel* ſeems to make it more probable it did (though upon what account it was ſo intitled, is not poſſible for us now to gueſs), than, as Mr. Fabritius ſuppoſes, that it was *a diſtinct title of a different book from either*; viz. either the *ſeventh Book of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, or the *laſt Part of the Epiſtle of Barnabas*; *into one of which this book of the Two Ways was taken.*

2. Dr. Grabe's conjecture concerning the *Judgment of Peter* is much more plauſible than the former, viz. *That it was the ſame with the Preaching of Peter.* What he offers ſeems ſo ingenious, that I ſhall give it the reader as exactly as I can. *As to* the Judgment of Peter, ſays he, *mentioned by Ruffin and Jerome, I doubt Ruffin meeting in ſome Greek books with the word* κρμα contractedly written for Κήρυγμα, thought it was deſigned for Κρίμα, and ſo tranſlated it in Latin *Judicium*; and Jerome following Ruffin, *without due conſideration looked upon it as a diſtinct book from the* Preaching of Peter, *when it was really the ſame* [b]. This ſeems very plauſible; but

[a] Annot. in Ruffin. Expoſit. Symbol. Apoſtol. in loc.

[b] Loc. jam cit.

I have to oppoſe to it, that it is very improbable Ruffin ſhould be guilty of ſuch a miſtake, or, if he was, that Jerome ſhould follow him in it.

Firſt, *It is highly improbable Ruffin ſhould be guilty of ſuch a miſtake*; for beſides that he was ſo much acquainted with the antient books, as appears by the many writings of his own, which are now extant, and the many Latin tranſlations which he made of others, (viz. Joſephus, Euſebius, Origen, Baſil, Gregory Nazianzen, &c.) *the Preaching of Peter* was a book mentioned by ſeveral writers, and particularly by Euſebius [a], whom he tranſlated into Latin, and whoſe hiſtory he continued to his time; and therefore it is not likely he ſhould miſtake any other name for this, eſpecially when it was a name that he had never known nor heard before. Beſides, it ſeems to me very improbable, that he ſhould thus read κρίμα for κήρυγμα, becauſe although κήρυγμα ſometimes ſhould be ſo contractedly written, as Dr. Grabe ſuppoſes, viz. κρμα, Ruffin could never imagine any ſcribe would make that contraction to ſtand for the word κρίμα, and that for this plain reaſon, that he would be as long in writing the contraction κρμα with the line on top, or longer, than in writing the word at length κρίμα.

Secondly, If we ſuppoſe Ruffin to have made this miſtake, *it is no way probable that Jerome ſhould follow him in it*; for Jerome did not write his *Catalogus Virorum Illuſtrium* till about the year 392, or afterwards; before which time there were ſuch fierce contentions between him and Ruffin, that make it very unlikely he ſhould tranſcribe the blunders of his books. But to ſay no more, in the very nature of the thing it can ſcarce be imagined that Jerome ſhould thus follow Ruffin; and therefore, ſeeing Ruffin and Jerome both ſpeak of a book called *the Judgment of Peter*, and Jerome ſpeaks of *the Judgment* and *Preaching of Peter* ſo very diſtinctly as in the place above, calling one the *third*, the other the *fifth* under Peter's name, I conclude this *Judgment* to have been really a diſtinct book.

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Dr. Mill has a conjecture much leſs probable than the former, concerning this *Judgment of Peter*, viz. that it *was the very ſame with the* Revelation of Peter (of which hereafter, Numb. LIII.) and as it was firſt called *Apocalypſis* by the Greeks, afterwards being by the Latins tranſlated, was called by them *Judicium*, or *Judgment*, becauſe it treated of *the Judgments of God denounced againſt, and ſhortly to be inflicted upon, the Jews.* But againſt this I urge,

1. That it does not appear, that the Revelation was written on this ſubject.

2. If it really was, the title, *Judicium Petri, would not have been given to it by any one who underſtood the Latin tongue*; for though the word *judgment* be uſed in this ſenſe in our language, viz. for the ſame idea as *vengeance from God*, yet in this antient time the word *judicium* was ſeldom or never uſed in this ſenſe. Beſides, if it had, the book muſt have been intitled, *Judicia Dei*, and not *Judicium Petri*, viz. *the Judgments of God*, not *the Judgment of Peter.* But of this enough.

CHAP. XXXIII.

The Preaching of Peter and Paul. An antient Epiſtle under the Name of Peter to James, relating to it, produced at length in Greek and Engliſh. Several large Fragments and Teſtimonies of the Antients concerning it.

Numb. LII. The PREACHING of PETER and PAUL: Or, The DOCTRINE of PETER.

THE reaſon of theſe different titles has in part been already aſſigned above, where I have proved that the *Preaching of Paul and Peter* were the titles *of one and the ſame book*[a].

[a] See above, Chap. XXX. Numb. XLV.

As for the title here given it, viz. *the Doctrine of Peter*, it will ſo clearly appear to belong to it in the ſequel of this Diſſertation, that I ſhall ſay no more concerning it here.

This book is not only a very antient one, but has been of very conſiderable repute, generally ſuppoſed to have been cited by ſome of the oldeſt Fathers, as Heracleon, Clemens, Theodotus, &c. and therefore requires much care in the diſcuſſing it: and indeed of all the Apocrypha of the New Teſtament, there is none, the conſideration of which is attended with greater difficulties than this, except the Goſpel of the Egyptians and the Nazarenes. The writers who have mentioned it, are as follow, viz.

I. The author of the Epiſtle under the name of *Peter to James.*

This, though unqueſtionably a forgery, yet ſeems to be a *very early one of ſome Ebionite*; and becauſe the Epiſtle itſelf does wholly relate to this book of *the Preaching of Peter*, and has been ſuppoſed by ſome to have been a Preface to it[a], I ſhall think it not improper to inſert it all, with an Engliſh tranſlation, here; though, were it not for this reaſon, it ought more properly to have been deferred to the third Part of this work. Wherefore I ſhall not here enter into large critical enquiries concerning it, only make ſuch few remarks as ſhall be neceſſary to the forming a better judgment concerning the Apocryphal book we have now under conſideration, viz. *the Preaching of Peter.*

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΕΤΡΟΥ πρὸς ΙΑΚΩΒΟΝ.

Πέτρος Ἰακώβῳ, τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας, ὑπὸ τῶν ἑλλων

The EPISTLE of PETER to JAMES.

Peter *to* James, *Lord and Biſhop of the Holy Church, (wiſhing) perpetual happi-*

[a] See Mr. Dodwell's learned Diſſertations on Irenæus. Diſſ. VI. §. 10. p. 441. The Epiſtle was firſt publiſhed by Cotelerius.

neſs

Πατρὸς, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν εἰρήνῃ πάντοτε.

ness from the Father of all things, through Jesus Christ.

I. ΕΙΔΩΣ σε, ἀδελφέ μου, εἰς τὸ κοινῇ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν συμφέρον σπεύδοντα προθύμως, ἀξιῶ καὶ δέομαι, τῶν ἐμῶν κηρυγμάτων ἃς ἐπεμψά σοι βίβλους, μηδενὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν μεταδοῦναι, μήτε ὁμοφύλῳ, πρὸ πείρας· ἀλλ' ἐάν τις δοκιμασθεὶς ἄξιος εὑρεθῇ, τότε αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀγωγὴν παραδοῦναι, καθ' ἣν καὶ τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα ὁ Μωϋσῆς παρέδωκε, τοῖς τὴν καθέδραν αὐτοῦ παραληφόσιν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ καρπὸς τῆς ἀσφαλείας μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο φαίνεται. Τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν οἱ πανταχῇ ὁμοεθνοὶ τῆς μοναρχίας καὶ πολιτείας φυλάσσουσι κανόνα· κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἄλλως φρονεῖν, ὑπὸ τῶν πολλὰ νενοσῶν γραφῶν ἐξοδευθῆναι δυνηθέντες. Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν παραδοθέντα αὐτοῖς κανόνα, τὰ τῶν γραφῶν ἀσύμφωνα πειρῶνται μεταρρυθμίζειν, εἰ δή

I. FOraſmuch, *my brother*, as I am perſuaded you are always very ready to forward any thing that is conducive to our common intereſt, I earneſtly intreat and deſire, that you would not deliver *the books of my Preaching*, which I have ſent you, to any one of the Gentiles, nor even to any one of *our country* (a Jew), before you are well acquainted with him; but if, after trial, he be found worthy, then let them be delivered to him after the ſame manner as Moſes delivered (his doctrine) to the *Seventy Men*, who were his ſucceſſors. For ſuch cautious methods have been hitherto ſucceſsful. And the people of that nation (viz. the Jews), whereſoever they be, obſerve the ſame rule of monarchy[a] and conduct; nor have by any means been induced by *thoſe Scriptures* (which contain various things) to entertain other ſentiments, or turn aſide. For according to the rules delivered to them, they endeavour to regulate the diſagreements of *the Scriptures*;

[a] Cotelerius tranſlates it *Eandem normam de unitate Dei et vitæ inſtitutione.*

τις τυχὸν μὴ εἰδὼς τὰς παραδόσεις, ναρκᾷ πρὸς τὰς τῶν Προφητῶν πολυσήμους φωνάς· ἕ ἕνεκεν ἀδενὶ διδάσκειν ἐπιτρέπουσιν, ἐὰν μὴ πρότερον μάθοι, πῶς δεῖ ταῖς γραφαῖς χρῆσθαι. Διὰ τοῦτο παρ' αὐτοῖς εἷς Θεὸς, εἷς νόμος, μία ἐλπίς.

but if any one happen to be ignorant of the traditions, he is to ſay nothing of the oracles of the Prophets, which have various ſignifications. Wherefore they permit no one to teach, unleſs he have before learned how the Scriptures ought to be handled. So that among them there is one God, one law, and one hope.

II. Ἵνα γὰν τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν γένηται τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα ἡμῶν ἀδελφοῖς, τὰς βίβλους μου τῶν κηρυγμάτων δὸς μετὰ τοῦ ὁμοίου τῆς ἀγωγῆς μυστηρίου, καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους τὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἀναδέξασθαι μέρος, ἐφοδιάζωσιν. Ἐπεὶ ἐὰν μὴ ἅπαξ γένηται, εἰς πολλὰς γνώμας ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας ἡμῶν διαιρεθήσεται λόγος. Τοῦτο δὲ οὐχ ὡς ὁ προφήτης ὢν ἐπίσταμαι· ἀλλ' ἤδη αὐτοῦ τοῦ κακοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁρῶν. Τινὲς γὰρ τῶν ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν, τὸ δι' ἐμοῦ νόμιμον ἀπεδοκίμασαν κήρυγμα, τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄνομόν τινα καὶ φλυαρώδη προσηκάμενοι διδασκαλίαν. Καὶ ταῦτα ἔτι μου περιόντος ἐπεχείρησάν τινες, ποικίλαις τισὶν ἑρμηνείαις

II. In order therefore that the like may be among us as the Seventy Men, and our brethren, deliver *the books of my Preaching* with the ſame artifice of ſecrecy, that they may ſerve to inſtruct thoſe who have a mind to undertake the office of teachers: otherwiſe my true doctrines will be divided into many different opinions. But this I do not pretend to foreknow as a Prophet, but as already ſeeing the beginnings of this miſchief. For ſome of the Gentiles have (already) rejected *my Preaching*, which is according to the Law, *adhering to the trifling doctrines of a perſon who is an enemy, and ſuch doctrines as are againſt the Law.* And theſe things ſome have attempted, even while I am alive, perverting the intent of my words

τὰς ἐμὰς λόγας μετασχηματίζειν, εἰς τὴν τᾶ νόμα κατάλυσιν· ὡς καὶ ἐμᾶ αὐτᾶ ἔτω μὲν φρονεύντω, μὴ ἐκ παῤῥησίας δὲ κηρύσσοντος· ὅπερ ἀπείη. Τὸ γὰρ τοιᾶτο, ἀντιπῤάσσειν ἐςὶ τῷ τᾶ Θεᾶ νόμῳ, τῷ διὰ Μωϋσέως ῥηθέντι καὶ ὑπὸ τᾶ Κυρίω ἡμῶν μαρτυρηθέντι, περὶ τᾶς ἰδίας αὐτᾶ διαμονᾶς. Ἐπεὶ ἔτως εἶπεν, Ὁ ὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γᾶ παρελεύσονται, ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία ἐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τᾶ νόμα. Τᾶτο δὲ εἴρηκεν, ἵνα τὰ πάντα γίνηται. Οἱ δὲ ἐκ οἶδα πῶς τὸν ἐμὸν νᾶν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, ἃς ἤκασαν ἐξ ἐμᾶ λόγας, ἐμᾶ τᾶ εἰπόντω αὐτὰς, φρονιμώτερον ἐπιχειρᾶσιν, λέγοντες τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν κατηχημένοις, τᾶτο εἶναι τὸ ἐμὸν φρόνημα, ὃ ἐγὼ ὐδὲν ἐνεθυμήθην. Εἰ δὲ ἐμᾶ ἔτι περιόντω τοιαῦτα τολμῶσιν καταψεύδεσθαι· πόσῳ γε μᾶλλον μετ' ἐμὲ ποιεῖν, οἱ μετ' ἐμὲ τολμήσασιν;

words by various interpretations, to (ſupport the doctrine of) *the abrogation of the Law*, as though I myſelf had been of that opinion, but had not courage enough plainly to declare it; which God forbid. But to do that would be to act contrary to the Law of God, which was given by Moſes, and *received a teſtimony of its everlaſting obligation by our Lord himſelf*, when he ſaid, *Heaven and earth ſhall paſs away, but one jot, or one tittle, ſhall by no means paſs from the Law*[a]. This he ſaid, that all things might be accompliſhed. But on the other hand they, engaging, by I know not what means, to declare my meaning, pretend (to explain) my words more wiſely than I who ſpake them, telling their catechumens, that is my meaning, of which I never ſo much as thought. But if while I am alive they be ſo impudent in lying, how much more will they venture to do the ſame after my death?

III. Ἵνα οὖν μὴ τοιοῦτόν τι γένηται, τᾶτα ἕνεκα ἠξίωσα καὶ ἐδεήθην, τῶν ἐμῶν κηρυγ-

III. That therefore none of theſe things may happen, I have earneſtly deſired and in-

[a] Mat. v. 18.

μάτων ἃς ἔπεμψά σοι βίβλους, μηδενὶ μεταδῶναι, μήτε ὁμοφύλῳ, μήτε ἀλλοφύλῳ, πρὸ πείρας· ἀλλ' ἐάν τις δοκιμασθεὶς ἄξιος εὑρεθῇ, τότε αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν Μωϋσέως ἀγωγὴν παραδῶναι, καθ' ἣν τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα παρέδωκεν, τοῖς τὴν καθέδραν αὐτοῦ παραλαβοῦσιν. Ἵνα ἔτως τὰς πίστεις φυλάξωσιν, καὶ πανταχῇ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα παραδῶσιν· ἑρμηνεύοντες τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν ἡμῶν· καὶ μὴ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ ἀμαθείας καταστρώμενοι, ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν στοχασμῶν εἰς πλάνην ἑλκόμενοι, ἄλλους εἰς τὸν ὅμοιον τῆς ἀπωλείας ἐνέγκωσιν βόθυνον. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐμοὶ δόξαντα καλῶς ἐσήμανά σοι· τὸ δέ σοι δοκοῦν, κύριέ μου, πρεπόντως ἐπιτέλει. Ἔρρωσο.

treated you *(in the beginning of my letter)* not to deliver *the books of my Preaching*, which I have ſent you, either to any one of our own country (a Jew) or Gentile, till you have firſt proved him (or are acquainted with him); and then, if after trial he be found worthy, to deliver them to him after the ſame manner as Moſes delivered his doctrine to the Seventy Men who were his ſucceſſors; that ſo they may keep the faith, and every where deliver the rule of truth, interpreting all things according to our tradition; and leſt, being themſelves perverted through ignorance, or drawn aſide by the conjectures of the mind into errors, they ſhould be the means of leading others into the ſame pit of deſtruction. And thus I have honeſtly given you my ſentiments; but you, O my Lord, do whatſoever you ſhall think moſt convenient. Farewel.

2. By Heracleon.

He was an early heretick of the ſecond century, and lived (as I ſhall ſhew hereafter) about the year of Chriſt 130. That he made uſe of this book, we are informed by Origen in the following words (tom 14. in Joan. p. 211.)

Φέρειν αὐτὸν, ὡς Πέτρος διδάξαντος, μὴ δεῖν καθ' Ἕλληνας

He (viz. Heracleon) urged that Peter taught, that *we ought*

προσκυνεῖν τὰ τῆς ὕλης πράγματα, ἀποδεχομένας καὶ λατρεύοντας ξύλοις καὶ λίθοις, μήτε κατὰ Ἰουδαίους σέβειν τὸ θεῖον· ἐπείπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ μόνοι οἰόμενοι ἐπίστασθαι Θεὸν, ἀγνοεῖσιν αὐτὸν, λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλοις, καὶ μηνὶ, καὶ σελήνῃ.

ought not to worſhip as the Gentiles, paying reſpect to material things, and adoring wood and ſtones; nor as the Jews worſhipped the Deity; for they, pretending to be the only perſons who know God, are ignorant of him, ſeeing they worſhip angels, and months, and the moon.

That this paſſage was in the *Preaching of Peter*, is evident from that of Clemens Alexandrinus in this Chapter, Numb. III.

3. By Clemens Alexandrinus.

He ſo often cites this book, that I ſhall have frequent occaſion to refer to his citations; and therefore, for the eaſe of the reader, ſhall number them diſtinctly.

I. Strom. lib. 1. p. 357.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ Πέτρου κηρύγματι εὕροις ἂν νόμον καὶ λόγον τὸν Κύριον προσαγορευόμενον.

In the *Preaching of Peter*, you may find the Lord called *the Law and the Word.*

II. Strom. lib. 2. p. 390.

Ἀλλ' ἡ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Κυρίᾳ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ. Ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι νόμον καὶ λόγον τὸν Κύριον προσεῖπεν.

But the will of the Lord is in his law. Peter *in his Preaching* calls the Lord (both) *the Law and the Word.*

III. Strom. lib. 6. p. 635.

Ὅτι δὲ ὁ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν ἴσασι τὸν Θεὸν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ περίφασιν, Ἑλλήνων οἱ δοκιμώτατοι, Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι λέγει· Γινώσκετε οὖν ὅτι εἷς

But that the moſt excellent perſons among the Gentiles had not (any true) knowledge of God, but only ſuch as was very general, Peter informs us *in his Preaching* (ſaying), "Know

Θεός ἐστιν, ὃς ἀρχὴν πάντων ἐποίησεν, καὶ τέλος ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ ὁ ἀόρατος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ὁρᾷ· ἀχώρητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα χωρεῖ, ἀνεπιδεής, οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐπιδέεται, καὶ δι' ὃν ἐστιν· ἀκατάληπτος, ἀίδιος, ἄφθαρτος, ἀποίητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, τῆς γνωστικῆς γραφῆς, τετέστι τοῦ υἱοῦ. Τοῦτον τὸν θεὸν σέβεσθε, μὴ κατὰ τὰς Ἕλληνας, ὡς δηλονότι τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν σεβόντων Θεὸν, καὶ τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι δοκίμων, ἀλλ' ὃ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν παντελῆ τὴν δι' υἱοῦ παράδοσιν μεμαθηκότων. Μὴ τοίνυν, φησὶ, σέβεσθε, ὃν εἶπεν, Θεὸν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀλλὰ μὴ κατὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, τὸν τρόπον τὸν τῆς σεβήσεως ἐναλάττων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἄλλον καταγγέλλων· τί ἂν εἴη τὸ, Μὴ κατὰ τὰς Ἕλληνας, αὐτὸς διασαφήσει Πέτρος ἐπιφέρων, Ὅτι ἀγνοίᾳ φερόμενοι καὶ μὴ ἐπιγάμενοι τὸν Θεὸν, ὡς ἡμεῖς, κατὰ τὴν γνῶσιν τὴν τελείαν, ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίας εἰς

" Know that there is but one " God, who gave all things " their original exiſtence, and " has power over their end; " who is inviſible, and ſees " all things; incomprehen- " ſible, but comprehends all; " not wanting any thing, but " whom all things want, and " on whom all things de- " pend; infinite, eternal, im- " mortal, unmade, who made " all things by the Word of " his power, the knowing " Word (Scripture), i. e. his " Son. This God worſhip, " not as the Gentiles do; " even thoſe who were the " moſt underſtanding among " the Gentiles, who worſhip " the ſame God as we do, " but not with a perfect " knowledge, as having re- " ceived inſtruction from his " Son." *He does not ſay*, Do not *worſhip the ſame God whom the Gentiles do, but after the ſame manner which the Gentiles do, changing the manner of worſhipping God, but not declaring any other God (to be worſhipped). But what this means*, Do not worſhip as the Greeks, *Peter himſelf will explain in what he ſub-*

joins, viz. " Being carried away in their ignorance, and " not knowing God as we know him, with that perfect " knowledge, which he gave them the power of uſing,

" but

χρῆσιν, μορφώσαντες ξύλα καὶ λίθες, χαλκὸν καὶ σίδηρον, χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον, τῆς ὕλης αὐτῶν καὶ χρήσεως, τὰ δέλα τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἀναςήσαντες σέβονται· καὶ ἃ δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς εἰς βρῶσιν ὁ Θεὸς, πετεινὰ τὰ ἀέρος, καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τὰ νηκτὰ, καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ ἑρπετὰ, καὶ τὰ θηρία σὺν κτήνεσι τετραπόδοις τὰ ἀγρὰ, γαλᾶς τε καὶ μῦς, αἰλούρους τε καὶ κύνας, καὶ πιθήκους, καὶ τὰ ἴδια βρώματα, βροτοῖς θύματα θύουσιν, καὶ νεκρὰ νεκροῖς προσφέροντες ὡς θεοῖς, ἀχαριςοῦσι τῷ Θεῷ, διὰ τούτων ἀρνούμενοι αὐτὸν εἶναι· καὶ ὅτι γε ὡς τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ Ἑλλήνων ἐγνωκότων φέρεται, πλὴν οὐχ ὁμοίως, ἐποίσει πάλιν ὠδέπως, Μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους σέβεσθε· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι μόνοι οἰόμενοι τὸν Θεὸν γινώσκειν, οὐκ ἐπίστανται, λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀρχαγγέλοις, μηνὶ καὶ σελήνῃ, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σελήνη φανῇ, σάββατον οὐκ ἄγουσι τὸ λεγόμενον

" but changing wood and " ſtones, braſs and iron, " gold and ſilver, from being " mere matter, which was all " they were deſigned for, " they have ſo far exalted " theſe the ſervants of life, " as to worſhip them. Alſo " thoſe things which God " gave them for food, the " birds of the air, and the " fiſh of the ſea, and the in- " ſects of the earth, and the " beaſts and four-footed cattle " of the field, and weaſels, " and mice, and cats and " dogs, and monkeys, and " the food of men, they offer " up in ſacrifices to men, and " ſo by theſe oblations of " dead things to thoſe who " are dead, as unto Gods, " they are unthankful to the " (true) God, by this means " denying him." *And that it is thus*, viz. *that the Gentiles have acknowledged the ſame God with us, though not in the ſame manner, he farther ſhews thus*, (ſaying) " Nei- " ther worſhip as the Jews " do; for they, pretending to " be the only perſons who " know God, are ignorant of " him, worſhipping Angels and Archangels, and the month " and the moon; and unleſs the moon appear, they do not " keep that Sabbath, which is called the firſt, neither do " they (for the ſame reaſon) keep their new moon, nor the " feaſt

πρῶτον, ἐδὲ νεομηνίαν ἄγεσιν, ἔτε ἄζυμα, ἔτε ἑορτὴν, ἔτε μεγάλην ἡμέραν. Εἶτα τὸν κολοφῶνα τῶ ζητεμένε προσεπιφέρει· ὥστε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως μανθάνοντες, ἃ παραδίδομεν ὑμῖν, φυλάσσεσθε, καινῶς τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τῦ Χριςῦ σεβόμενοι· εὑρομεν γὰρ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, καθὼς ὁ Κύριος λέγει, Ἰδὲ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καινὴν διαθήκην, ἐχ ὡς διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν ἐν ὄρει Χωρήβ.

"feaſt of unleavened bread, "nor their feaſt (of the paſſo-"ver), nor their great day." *Then he concludes the debate thus*; "Wherefore do ye, "religiouſly and faithfully "learning what I have deli-"vered to you, obſerve it, "worſhipping God in this "new way through Chriſt. "For we have found it in the "Scriptures, that the Lord "has thus ſaid, Behold, a new "covenant I make with you, "not ſuch as I made with "your Fathers in Horeb."

IV. Strom. lib. 6. p. 636.

Ἐπεὶ ὅτι καθάπερ Ἰεδαίες σώζεσθαι ἐβέλετο ὁ Θεὸς, τὲς προφήτας διδὲς, ἔτως καὶ Ἑλλήνων τὲς δοκιμωτάτες οἰκείες αὐτῶν τῇ διαλέκτῳ προφήτας ἀναςήσας, ὡς οἷοί τε ἦσαν δέχεσθαι τὴν παρὰ Θεᾶ εὐεργεσίαν, τῶν χυδαίων ἀνθρώπων διέκρινεν· δηλώσει πρὸς τῷ Πέτρε κηρύγματι ὁ ἀπόσο-

Inaſmuch therefore as God determined the ſalvation of the Jews, and for that reaſon gave them Prophets, ſo alſo having raiſed up ſome of the moſt excellent of the Gentiles to be Prophets to them in their own languages, as they were capable of receiving the kindneſs of God; that he diſtinguiſhed them from the bulk of mankind; beſides the *Preaching of Peter*[a], Paul the Apoſtle will make

[a] Cotelerius ſuppoſes, that Paul is here cited by Clemens on account of his calling Epimenides a Greek poet in his Epiſtle to Titus, i. 12. and conſequently that the following words are the words of Clemens, and not of this Apocryphal book. But in this he muſt needs be miſtaken, becauſe Clemens adds the word λέγων, which introduces the next ſentence, and evidences that it is a citation; beſides, a little after Clemens brings in ſome perſon aſking a queſtion; πυνθάνεται ἡμῶν, he

λῶ λέγων Παῦλῶ, Ἀάβετε καὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς βίβλους, ἐπίγνωτε Σίβυλλαν, ὡς δηλοῖ ἕνα Θεὸν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι· καὶ τὸν Ὑστάσπην λαβόντες ἀνάγνωτε, καὶ εὑρήσετε πολλῷ τηλαυγέστερον καὶ σαφέστερον γεγραμμένον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ καθὼς παράταξιν ποιήσασι τῷ χριστῷ πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς, μισοῦντες αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς φορουμένους τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ· εἶτα ἐν λόγῳ συνθάνεται ἡμῖν, Ὅλος δὲ ὁ κόσμος, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, τίνος, οὐχὶ τοῦ θεοῦ; διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος εἰρηκέναι τὸν κύριον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, Ἐὰν μὲν οὖν τις θελήσῃ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μετανοῆσαι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου καὶ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν, ἀφεθήσονται αὐτῷ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· Μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον, μή τις εἴπῃ, οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν.—

make manifeſt in what he ſays, "Take alſo the Greek "books, acknowledge the "Sibylline oracles (and ſee) "how they declare one God, "and (predict) things future. "Take alſo and read Hy-"ſtaſpes, and you will there "find the Son of God more "clearly and evidently de-"ſcribed, and that many "kings would endeavour to "make head againſt Chriſt, "hating him, and thoſe who "were called by his name, "and his faithful followers; "and alſo his ſufferings and "(ſecond) coming." *Then in one word he aſks us*, "Whoſe "is the world, and all that is "in it? Is it not God's?" *Wherefore Peter ſaith*, "That "the Lord ſaid to the Apoſ-"tles," *If therefore any man of Iſrael will repent, and through my name believe on God, his ſins ſhall be pardoned. After twelve years, go ye out into the world, that no man may ſay*, We have not heard.

he aſks us; this cannot poſſibly mean himſelf, but ſome third perſon, who can be no other than Paul, whom he had juſt before cited. And inaſmuch as immediately both before this citation of Paul, and after it, we have citations out of *the Preaching of Peter*; and this has been above proved out of Lactantius to be the ſame with the *Preaching of Paul*; I ſuppoſe this obſcure expreſſion of Clemens will be beſt explained, by ſuppoſing that ſome *part of this book contained* the Preachings of Peter, *and others* the Preaching of Paul; and ſo both were for this reaſon cited thus together. See Grab. Spicil. Patr. t. 1. p. 66.

V. Strom.

V. Strom. lib. 6. p. 639.

Αὐτίκα ἐν τῷ Πέτρᾳ κηρύγματι ὁ Κύριός φησι πρὸς τὲς μαθητὰς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάςασιν, Ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς δώδεκα μαθητὰς, κρίνας ἀξίες ἐμέ.

But in the Preaching of Peter, the Lord ſaid to his diſciples after the reſurrection, *I have choſen you twelve diſciples, having judged you worthy.*

VI. Strom. lib. 6. p. 678.

Καὶ οἱ τότε γνώριμοι, οἱ κηρύξαντες τὸν λόγον, ὡς αὐτὸς, μετ' αὐτὸν τὸ ζῆν παρεβάλοντο. Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι περὶ τῶν ἀποςόλων λέγων, φησὶν, Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀναπτύξαντες τὰς βίβλες ἃς εἴχομεν τῶν προφητῶν, ἃ μὲν διὰ παραβολῶν, ἃ δὲ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἃ δὲ αὐθεντικῶς καὶ αὐτολεξεὶ τὸν Χριςὸν Ἰησᾶν ὀνομαζόντων· εὕρομεν καὶ τὴν παρεσίαν αὐτᾶ, καὶ τὸν θάνατον, καὶ τὸν ςαυρὸν, καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς κολάσεις πάσας, ὅσας ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν, καὶ τὴν εἰς ὐρανὲς ἀνάληψιν, πρὸ τᾶ Ἱεροσόλυμα κτισθῆναι, καθὼς ἐγέγραπτο· ταῦτα πάντα ἃ ἔδει αὐτὸν παθεῖν, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἃ ἔσαι. Ταῦτα οὖν ἐπιγνόντες, ἐπιςεύσαμεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τῶν

And the companions of Chriſt who preached the Word, as he did, after his death, made uſe of parables. Whence *Peter in his Preaching, ſpeaking of the Apoſtles*, ſaith, "But "when we peruſed the books "which we have of the Pro- "phets, in which ſome things "are delivered in parables, "ſome things in enigmatical "deſcriptions, ſome things "poſitive, and even the name "of Jeſus Chriſt expreſſed "in ſo many words; we "found alſo his coming and "death and croſs, and all his "other ſufferings, which the "Jews inflicted on him, and "his reſurrection, and being "taken up to heaven before "Jeruſalem was built, as it "is written." *Theſe things are all what he ought to have ſuffered, and thoſe things which ſhould be after him.* "We therefore, when we "perceived theſe things, be- "lieved in God, by means of thoſe things which were written

"con-

γεγραμμένων εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα ἐπιφέρει πάλιν, Θεία προνοίᾳ τὰς προφητείας γεγενῆσθαι, παρισᾶς ὧδε· ἴσμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὰ προσέταξεν ὄντως, καὶ ἀδὲν ἄτερ γραφῆς λέγομεν.

"concerning him." *And a little after he again infers, that the prophecies were written by God's appointment, saying thus,* "For we know "that God really appointed "these things, and without "the Scripture we say no-"thing."

4. By Theodotus Byzantius [a].

He was an early writer in the second century; of whom and whose works I shall give some account in the next number, viz. concerning the *Revelation of Peter.*

Ὁ νόμος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄμωμος, ἐπιστρέφων ψυχάς· νόμος καὶ λόγος αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ λέγεται, ὡς Πέτρος ἐν κηρύγματι.

The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; even our Saviour himself is called the Law and the Word, as *Peter says in his Preaching.*

5. By Origen [b].

I thought it proper to cite Origen here, though the place I refer to be the same with that above produced in this Chapter, Numb. II. concerning Heracleon; only I have here to add, that after Origen had mentioned Heracleon's urging this *Preaching of Peter*, he subjoins a promise in another place to discuss πότερόν ποτε γνήσιόν ἐστιν, ἢ νόθον, ἢ μικτόν, *whether it be esteemed as a genuine, spurious, or mixt piece.* But this it does not appear he any where has done.

6. By the same [c].

That which he calls in this passage *the Doctrine of Peter*, is undoubtedly the same with *the Preaching*; as will ap-

[a] In Eclog. seu Excerpt. ad Calc. Opp. Clem. Alex. p. 809.
[b] Tom. xiv. in Joan, p. 211.
[c] Præfat. in Lib. 1. de Princip. fol. 112.

pear

pear in the following part of this diſcourſe. His words are;

Si vero quis velit nobis proferre ex illo libello qui Petri Doctrina appellatur, ubi Salvator videtur ad diſcipulos dicere, Non ſit dæmonium incorporeum; primo reſpondendum eſt ei, quod ille liber inter libros Eccleſiaſticos non habetur, et oſtendendum, quod neque Petri eſt ea ſcriptura, neque alterius cujuſquam qui Spiritu Dei fuerit inſpiratus.

But if any one urge againſt us teſtimonies out of that little book which is called, *The Doctrine of Peter*, wherein our Saviour ſeems to ſay to his diſciples, *That he was not an incorporeal Spirit*, I would anſwer to him firſt, That that book is not to be reckoned among the Eccleſiaſtical books, and make it appear, that it is *neither the writing of Peter*, nor of any other perſon who was inſpired by the Spirit of God.

7. By the anonymous author of a book, concerning Rebaptiſation in Cyprian's time [a].

Eſt autem adulterini hujus, imo internecini baptiſmatis, ſi quis alius auctor, tum etiam quidam ab iiſdem ipſis hæreticis propter hunc eundem errorem confictus liber, qui inſcribitur Pauli (Petri) prædicatio. In quo libro contra omnes Scripturas, et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Chriſtum, qui ſolus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Johannis baptiſma pene invitum, a matre ſua Maria eſſe compulſum: Item cum baptiſaretur, ignem

But the principal foundation of this falſe and pernicious baptiſm is a book *forged by theſe ſame hereticks, to ſupport this error*, which is called *the Preaching of Paul* (or *Peter.*) In which book, contrary to all the Scriptures, you will find *Chriſt (who alone was clear of all ſin) both confeſſing his own ſin, and being almoſt unwilling to receive the baptiſm of John, was compelled to it by his mother Mary.* Alſo, that when he was baptiſed, *fire was ſeen upon the river*

[a] Edit. a Rigalt. ad fin. Opp. Cypr.

(which

ſuper aquam eſſe viſum: (quod in Evangelio nullo eſt ſcriptum) et poſt tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, poſt conlationem Evangelii in Hieruſalem, et mutuam altercationem et rerum agendarum diſpoſitionem, poſtremo in urbe, quaſi tunc primum invicem ſibi eſſe cognitos. Et quædam alia hujuſcemodi, abſurde ac turpiter conficta. Quæ omnia in librum illum invenies congeſta.

(which is not written in any one of the Goſpels); and after ſome conſiderable time, that Peter and Paul (though they had before had a conference concerning the doctrine of the Goſpel at Jeruſalem, and ſome diſpute) did afterwards meet in the city, *utterly unknown to each other before.* And ſome other things of this ſort fooliſhly and baſely forged. All which you will find heaped together in that book.

8. By Lactantius, lib. 4. c. 21.

Magiſter aperuit illis omnia, quæ Petrus et Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt; et ea prædicatio in memoriam ſcripta permanſit: in qua cum multa alia mira, tum etiam hoc futurum eſſe dixerunt; ut poſt breve tempus immitteret Deus regem, qui expugnaret Judæos, et civitates eorum ſolo adæquaret, ipſos autem fame ſitique confectos obſideret. Tum fore, ut corporibus ſuorum veſcerentur, et conſumerent ſe invicem; poſtremo ut capti venirent in manus hoſtium, et in conſpectu ſuo vex-

The Maſter (Chriſt) explained all things to them, which Peter and Paul *did preach at Rome; and that preaching being committed to writing, that it might not be forgot, continues* (until now). In which, with many other ſtrange things, they alſo *have predicted the following things, viz. That after a ſhort time God would ſend a king, who ſhould wage war againſt the Jews, and deſtroy their city to the ground, and beſiege them, till they were worn out with hunger and thirſt; then it ſhould come to paſs, that they ſhould feed upon their own bodies, and deſtroy one another, and at laſt become captives in the hands of their enemies; and that they ſhould ſee the great diſtreſs of their wives, their*

ari acerbiſſime conjuges ſuas cernerent, violari ac proſtitui virgines, diripi pueros, allidi parvulos, omnia denique igne ferroque vaſtari, captivos in perpetuum terris ſuis exterminari, eo quod exultaverint ſuper amantiſſimum et probatiſſimum Dei Filium.

young women proſtituted and debauched, their children torn in pieces, and their little ones daſhed in pieces; in a word, all things deſtroyed by fire and ſword, and themſelves for ever baniſhed from their own country, becauſe they deſpiſed the moſt loving and excellent Son of God.

9. By Euſebius, Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 3.

Τό τε λεγόμενον αὐτῦ κήρυγμα——ἀδ' ὅλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένον, ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων, μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῦ συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις.

But that which is called *the Preaching of Peter* is not by any means to be eſteemed Canonical, inaſmuch as none of the antients, nor any of our eccleſiaſtical writers have taken teſtimonies out of it.

10. By Jerome, Catal. Vir. illuſtr. in Petro.

Libri autem ejus, e quibus unus Actorum ejus inſcribitur, alius Evangelii, tertius Prædicationis—inter Apocryphas Scripturas reputantur.

But thoſe (other) books called his, among which one is, his Acts, another his Goſpel, a *third his Preaching*——are reckoned among Apocryphal Scriptures.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXIV.

The Sentiments of later Writers concerning the Preaching of Peter. It has been generally very highly eſteemed, but upon very weak Reaſons. The Doctrine of Peter the ſame as the Preaching of Peter. It was Apocryphal, being never cited with any Authority. An Account of Heracleon and Theodotus, two antient Hereticks, and their Principles. It contained ſeveral Things falſe; as that Chriſt was a Sinner, and that the Law of Moſes was of everlaſting Obligation, &c. A Conjecture concerning the Epiſtle of Peter to James. The Preaching of Peter Apocryphal, becauſe it makes Peter and Paul appeal to the Sibylline Oracles for the Confirmation of Chriſtianity. An Account of the Sibyll's Prophecies. They were in a great Meaſure the Forgeries of Chriſtians. Paul and Peter did not cite them.

NOTHING is more commonly the occaſion of the miſtakes, into which learned men have fallen, than a ſecret reſolution to make all things, if poſſible, agreeable to their former preconceived opinions. This appears very evidently the caſe, in reſpect of the falſe notions many have entertained concerning this Apocryphal *Preaching of Peter and Paul.* It had been a ſettled opinion that Clemens Alexandrinus cited and highly valued it. On this account a favourable opinion was entertained by many of the book; and by this means later writers ſtifling, or at leaſt not regarding the obvious evidence that is to be brought againſt it, have extolled it in a very unjuſt and unreaſonable manner, as I hope plainly to ſhew; and in order thereto ſhall firſt produce their ſeveral opinions.

1. Sixtus Senenſis [a] diſcourſing concerning the Sibylls, tells us, that the *Apoſtle Paul exhorts his Diſciples to the reading of the Sibylline Oracles, referring to the place above-cited of Clemens, in the laſt Chapter,* Numb. IV. whereby though he calls

[a] Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 2. p. 113. ad voc. Sibyl.

it *recondita Scriptura*, it is plain he meant the book now under conſideration, and *believed it to be the very writing of St. Paul*; and a little after adds, "*And ſo I, according to the advice of Paul, ſhall write ſome things concerning the Sibylls.*" In another place [a], *It was of authority among the antients, becauſe Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen have cited it.*

2. Cardinal Baronius [b] endeavours to ſupport the credit of this book attributed to Paul, wherein he is made to refer to the Sibylls (ſee Chap. preced. Numb. III.) becauſe St. Paul *has in ſome other parts of his writings, now received, taken citations out of the Greek poets.*

3. Dr. Cave [c], though he looked upon it as ſpurious, yet ſuppoſes both *it and the other Apocryphal pieces under the name of Peter to have been written either in the Apoſtolick age, or that which was next to it.*

4. Dr. Grabe [d] ſaith, *All the fragments of it are perfectly orthodox, and the authors of it Catholick Chriſtians, becauſe Clemens Alexandrinus, and after him other orthodox Fathers, have frequently cited it*;——*that it was written ſoon after the death of Peter by ſome of that Apoſtle's Diſciples, who wrote down what they had heard him preach, to communicate it to poſterity*——And in another place [e], by the ſame weak argument as Baronius, ſays, *He knows not any reaſon why ſome Diſciple of the Apoſtles, who heard the* Preaching of Peter and Paul, *might not aſcribe thoſe citations out of the Sibylline Oracles to St. Paul, ſeeing he cites Aratus,* Acts xvii. 28.—*Why then might not the author of this* Preaching *rightly ſay, that St. Paul made uſe of the Sibylls, and other ſuch ſort of prophecies?*

5. Mr. Toland [f]. *The Seven Books*, viz. the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, *that* of James, the ſecond of Peter, the ſecond and third of John, the Epiſtle of Jude, *and* the Revelation,

[a] Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 2. p. 91. ad voc. Petrus.

[b] Apparat. ad Annal. apud Caſaub. Exercit. I. Num. XVIII. cont. Baron.

[c] Hiſtor. Literar. in Petro, p. 5.

[d] Spicileg. Patr. Secul. I. p. 61, 62.

[e] P. 66.

[f] Amyntor. p. 56, 57.

were

were a long time doubted by the antients, particularly by thoſe whom we eſteem the ſoundeſt part; and yet they are received not without convincing arguments by the moderns: now I ſay by more than a parity of reaſon, that the Preaching of Peter, *and his* Revelation *(for example) were received by the antients, and ought not therefore to be rejected by the moderns, if the approbation of the Fathers be a proper recommendation of any books.*

6. Dr. Mill[a] thinks this *Preaching* was publiſhed *not long after Peter's death, containing ſeveral moral inſtructions relating to the worſhip of God, which were taken from the Apoſtle's mouth, and committed to writing by his Diſciples; and that ſuch are the fragments of it now remaining.*

7. Mr. Whiſton[b] would have it in ſome ſenſe *to be looked upon as one of the ſacred books.*

Notwithſtanding this concurrence of opinions, to elevate the authority of this *Preaching of Peter*, I am not afraid to aſſert it a moſt ridiculous, ſilly, and impious forgery. To eſtabliſh which aſſertion, I obſerve,

Firſt, That Origen, the anonymous Author in Cyprian's time, Euſebius, and Jerome *have expreſsly and plainly rejected it as a ſpurious and Apocryphal piece.* This is evident from the places produced in the laſt chapter, Numb. 6, 7, 9, 10. Nor can there be any doubt concerning this, as to either of them, except that Origen calls it, Numb. 6. *The Doctrine of Peter*, and not *The Preaching of Peter:* to which I anſwer, that theſe two were only different titles for the ſame book, as is confeſſed by Dr. Cave and Dr. Grabe, in the places juſt now cited, and ſeems evident for theſe two reaſons; viz.

1. That a paſſage produced by Cotelerius out of *the Preaching of Peter* is by Damaſcenus cited out of *the Doctrine of Peter*[c].

2. As ſeveral things ſeem inſerted into *the Preaching of Peter*, which were in *the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, (viz. that of *Chriſt confeſſing his ſins*, and *being unwilling to be baptized*

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſt. §. 133.
[b] Eſſay on Conſtit. p. 24.
[c] Vid. Grab. loc. cit.

by John till his mother compelled him; ſee Numb. 7. in the foregoing Chapter, and compare it with the paſſage in the Hebrew Goſpel above in this Part, Chap. XXV. Numb. 15.) ſo alſo the paſſage produced by Origen out of *the Doctrine of Peter*, concerning Chriſt's not *being an incorporeal demon* (above, Chap. preced. Numb. 6.) *ſeems taken out of the Nazarene Goſpel* as above, Chap. XXV. Numb. 27, 28. The *Preaching* therefore and *Doctrine of Peter* being confeſſed to be the ſame book, I argue againſt Dr. Grabe, that Origen's rejecting the one is rejecting the other; and therefore, though he do not in one place determine, whether it be ſpurious, genuine, or mixed; (ſee Chap. preced. Numb. 5, and Numb. 2.) yet he doth ſo fully determine the matter here, by not allowing it to be ſo much *as an Eccleſiaſtical Book*, that we need ſay no more of his ſentiments concerning it. I conclude it therefore Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI. And whereas it may be objected, that though it be not cited but rejected by theſe Fathers, yet it *was approved* by Heracleon, Theodotus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Lactantius: I only anſwer as to the two firſt, *they were Hereticks of the worſt ſort*; Heracleon was indeed an early one, the predeceſſor of Cerdo, and a companion of Valentinus, who were at Rome in the time of Hyginus, the eighth biſhop of that place, and conſequently about the year of Chriſt CXXX[a]. He had the ſame principles with Valentinus, and added ſeveral new ones[b]. He who will read Irenæus's account of Valentinus[c], and that in Epiphanius[d] concerning Heracleon, his *Ogdoades*, his *Thirty Æones*, his *Two firſt Principles of all things*, his *Firſt Man the parent of all, whom he calls Bythus, and declares to have been neither male, nor female, from whom the univerſal mother of all things, whom he calls Sige, aroſe*, will not think it any credit to this book that he received it. Theodotus lived towards the end of that century, a heretick ſo infamous, that he was excommunicated by Pope Victor: he entertained the moſt

[a] See Iren. adv. Hæreſ. l. 2. c. 4. et lib. 3. c. 4.

[b] Tertull. de Preſcript. adv. Hæreſ. c. 49. Epiphan. Hæreſ. 36. §. 2. and Hæreſ. 41. §. 1. Auguſt. de Hæreſ. ad Quodvult. N. 16.

[c] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 2. paſſim.

[d] Locis jam citatis.

ridiculous

ridiculous tenets concerning Chriſt, *as being a mere man, the angels being material beings, and more or leſs ſo, according to their reſpective dignities; that they were of different ſexes, commanded the ſtars, which had ſo great influence upon human bodies and actions, that Chriſt came in our nature, and ſuffered, to deliver thoſe who believed in him therefrom*[a]. Such were the perſons who firſt uſed this *Preaching*; from whence it is not difficult to form a judgment concerning the deſign and tendency of the book. As to the paſſages taken out of it by Clemens Alexandrinus and Lactantius, I ſhall conſider them preſently, and alſo in what manner they cited them.

Secondly, I obſerve, that this book was ſpurious and Apocryphal, by Prop. VIII. becauſe it contained ſeveral things contrary to thoſe which are certainly known to be true.

Such is that of *Chriſt confeſſing his ſins, and being unwilling to be baptiſed*, in that paſſage, Chap. preced. Numb. 7. This is contrary to the whole deſign of Chriſtianity, as has been above proved; (ſee Chap. XXIX.) which ſuppoſes the perſon, who was to make atonement, to have been without ſin; and what is worth obſerving, directly contradicts what both Paul and Peter (the pretended Authors of this Book) have wrote elſewhere, 2 Cor. v. 21. Heb. iv. 15. and 1 Pet. ii. 22. Not much different is the *ſtory of Chriſt's being compelled by his Mother to ſubmit to John's baptiſm*; which implies him either to have been defective in wiſdom, not knowing what he ought to do; or elſe in duty, not being inclined to what he ought to have done, or both.

Thirdly, I argue it of falſehood or contrariety to known truths, and therefore Apocryphal, by Prop. VIII. *becauſe it was intended and wrote with a deſign to ſupport the doctrine of the eternal obligation of the Ceremonial Law of Moſes.* This is moſt undeniably evident from the ſeveral paſſages in the pretended Letter of Peter to James (produced in the preceding Chapter, Numb. 1.) which, though evidently a forgery, cannot be ſuppoſed to have taken things out of this Book of Peter's

[a] Vid. Excerpt. ad fin. Opp. Clem. Alex. per tot. et Epiphan. Hæreſ. 54.

Preaching, which were not in it. Now in that Epiſtle the pretended Peter, §. 2. *calls his Preaching* νόμιμον, that is, *according to the Law*; and in the ſame place *ſpeaks in very hard language of thoſe who oppoſed the obſervation of the Law*, calling ſuch oppoſition *miſchievous*; and him, who was the oppoſer, *an enemy, and a teacher of trifling doctrines againſt the Law*; by whom, without doubt, the Author meant Paul, whom the Ebionites ever eſteemed as their great enemy, becauſe he oppoſed their Law, and therefore were wont to call him, *an apoſtate from the Law*, and ſcandaliſed him, as *being induced to this by a diſappointment he met with in an amour with the High Prieſt's daughter*. See above in this Part, Chap. XVII. Numb. XVII. A little after, the ſame Author *blames ſome who expounded ſome places of his works, as countenancing the doctrine of the abrogation of the Law*, declares *he had no ſuch thoughts*, and introduces *Chriſt as aſſerting the neceſſity of a perpetual obſervation of the Law*. From all which it is moſt clearly manifeſt, the great deſign of the book, called *The Preaching of Peter*, was *to encourage the Judaiſing Chriſtians*, viz. *the Nazarenes and Ebionites, in their medley Religion of obeying the precepts of Moſes, and believing in Chriſt*. But all this every Chriſtian knows, is directly contrary to the very principles of his Religion, which neceſſarily ſuppoſes the entire aboliſhment of the Moſaick œconomy; and as one of the foundations of which, he believes that not only Chriſt, but St. Paul repealed the whole ſyſtem of ceremonies, as what neither the Jews nor Gentiles were to be obliged by. It would be ſuperfluous for me to ſay any more on this head, it being agreed on by all Chriſtians; only I cannot but remark here, that though St. Peter was indeed for ſome time (till he had his viſion, Acts x.) *an obſerver of the Law*, yet afterwards he was not wanting *in declaring againſt the obligation of the Law*, and in the *council at Jeruſalem* calls it a *yoke, which neither the Jews nor their fathers were able to bear*, Acts xv. 10. And in this doctrine we ſhall find the primitive Chriſtians generally agreed, except only thoſe called Nazarenes and Ebionites; of whom the catholick churches had ſo very mean an opinion, that they always ſtyled them hereticks, and reckoned

oned them to be Chriſtians *no farther than that they bore the name of Chriſt*; and hence Epiphanius[a] tells us, *they would not be called, nor call themſelves, Chriſtians, and were in all reſpects Jews, only that they profeſſed to believe on Chriſt.* I confeſs indeed, Mr. Toland has troubled the world with a book, in which he would endeavour to prove, that *theſe were the only true Chriſtians*, and therefore calls it *Nazarenus*; but his attempt is ſo weak, and has been ſo well anſwered by Dr. Mangey, that I ſhall take no farther notice of it; only will be ſo kind to tell Mr. Toland, that this ſpurious *Epiſtle of Peter to James* will be of great ſervice to him in any farther endeavours he may engage in to promote his original plan of Chriſtianity. As to the Epiſtle itſelf, I ſhall perhaps have occaſion in the next volume more critically to enquire into it; in the mean time I only obſerve, *that it was made by ſome Ebionite*, and conſequently *muſt be an antient piece*; for, if I miſtake not, the Ebionites did not continue in any conſiderable numbers, if at all, as a ſect after the fifth century; but whether it was the preface of this *Preaching of Peter*, as Mr. Dodwell imagines[b], or of the *Recognitions of Clement*, as Dr. Grabe conjectures[c], is not material here to enquire, though I rather incline to the former opinion. Whichſoever it was, it affords us a good argument againſt this Apocryphal *Preaching of Peter*.

Fourthly, I argue the *Preaching of Peter* to be Apocryphal, as containing things falſe, *becauſe it makes both Paul and Peter appeal to the Sibylline Oracles, the books of Hyſtaſpes, and ſuch like, for the confirmation of the Chriſtian Religion.* The matter of fact, as to Paul, is undeniable from that fragment in Clemens Alexandrinus in the preceding Chapter, Numb. III. where he is in ſo many words introduced, as exhorting thoſe to whom he wrote, to *acknowledge the Sibylline Oracles, and their predictions*; *to read Hyſtaſpes, and obſerve the clear deſcriptions he gives of Chriſt, his ſufferings, and the oppoſition he and his followers were to meet with in the world:* ſo alſo Peter is introduced (Numb. VI.) as ſaying, *that he had peruſed the books of the prophets, in which were very particular deſcriptions*

[a] Hæreſ. 29. §. 7.
[b] Diſſert. VI. in Iren. §. 10.
[c] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 59, 60.

of

of Chriſt, his coming, death, croſs, ſufferings, reſurrection, aſcenſion, and even his very name. To me it is evident, the prophets here referred to are the ſame with thoſe mentioned in the foregoing paſſage, viz. the Sibylls, Hyſtaſpes, &c. not only becauſe the prophecy there is of the ſame ſort with theſe, but becauſe we know of no other prophetick books, containing ſuch things. Indeed Dr. Grabe, in his notes at the end of the volume [a], ſuppoſes they were taken out of ſome Apocryphal book of the Old Teſtament: but this is plainly a groundleſs conjecture; if he means any book that pretended to belong to the Canon of the Jews. It is enough to anſwer, there never appears to have been any ſuch book; if otherwiſe, then there is all imaginable reaſon to conclude this Apocryphal Author meant the Sibylls, Hyſtaſpes, &c. The fact therefore is certain, that both Paul and Peter *in this book made uſe of the Sibylls' Oracles, and Hyſtaſpes, to confirm the truth of Chriſtianity:* and who, at firſt thought, will not condemn this as a falſehood? Could there be any neceſſity theſe Apoſtles, who had ſo much better arguments to convince the world, ſhould make uſe of ſuch abominable methods as theſe? Beſides, it was quite contrary to their practice; we find them, upon all occaſions, appealing to the records and prophecies of the Jews to prove Jeſus to be the Meſſiah; but never, beſides here, to any prophets among the Gentiles. In all their writings to the Gentiles, as well as Jews, no mention, no diſtant intimation, is to be found of their having ſeen or heard of any ſuch books. I might urge a variety of this ſort of arguments, but the matter is ſo plain, as not to need it; I ſhall only urge, that *theſe pretended prophecies were not in being when Peter and Paul lived.* The truth is, *the Sibylline verſes, and the books of Hyſtaſpes, Mercurius Triſmegiſtus, &c.* which ſpeak ſo clearly of Chriſt, and ſo highly of the Chriſtian Religion, *were no other than the forgeries of ſome more pious than honeſt Chriſtians in the firſt ages, deſigned to gain credit to their new Religion.* This has been largely proved by many, and is the

[a] P. 329.

opinion

opinion of Caſaubon [a], Daillé [b], Dr. Cave [c], Spanheim [d], Le Clerc [e], Fabritius [f], and in a manner all who have wrote of them. And indeed, were there no other arguments to prove them ſpurious, beſides what may be gathered from the fragment under conſideration, it would be ſufficient, viz. that *they ſo very particularly deſcribe the hiſtory of Chriſt, his coming, ſuffering, reſurrection, aſcenſion, and even his very name*, as others of them do *the whole buſineſs of Chriſtianity*; *Omnia hujus generis quo apertiora, eo fieri* (ſays Caſaubon) *ſuſpectiora*. For beſides that it is ſo improbable a thing in itſelf, that the Heathens ſhould have been favoured with ſuch prodigious diſcoveries, greater by far than any in the Law of Moſes, or the Prophets of the Old Teſtament; the coming of Chriſt, his miracles, doctrine, reſurrection, aſcenſion, ſending the Holy Ghoſt, &c. are always repreſented in the Scriptures as *great diſcoveries*; hence the diſpenſation of the Goſpel is by Paul called *a myſtery, which had been hid for ages and generations, but now is made manifeſt to his ſaints, to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this myſtery among the Gentiles, which is Chriſt, &c.* Col. i. 26, 27. But how St. Paul could ſay this, and believe the writings of Hyſtaſpes, and the Sibylls' verſes, is impoſſible to tell. I therefore conclude theſe Oracles to have been a forgery long after Peter and Paul's time, and therefore as they would not, ſo they could not appeal to them; and conſequently, this *Preaching of Peter and Paul* was a forgery too, and ſo not only Apocryphal by Prop. VIII. as containing things falſe, but alſo by Prop. X. as *containing things later than the time in which the Authors, whoſe name it bore, lived.* Under this head I would farther obſerve, that this ſpurious Author makes the Apoſtle Peter to *owe his own belief of Chriſtianity to the predictions of theſe books*, (fragment VI. of Clemens Alexandrinus, Chap. preced.) calls them *Scripture*, and ſays, *God really appointed them*, which are

[a] Adverſ. Baron. Exercit. I. Num. 18, &c.

[b] Right Uſe of the Fathers, c. 3. p. 18, 19.

[c] Hiſt. Liter. in Voc. Sibyll. p. 34.

[d] Spanh. Hiſt. Chriſt. Sec. II. p. 677.

[e] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sec. II. ad ann. cxxxi. p. 598, &c.

[f] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſtam. p. 300. tom. i.

yet

yet farther evidences of its ſpuriouſneſs, and is ſo abſurd, that I cannot but be ſurpriſed to obſerve Dr. Grabe ſo jumping in with that ſilly writer, as to call them *Scripture* too; and ſo according to his example, ſpeaking of it as though it were really St. Peter's, urging us *to prove every thing by the Scriptures.* Thus I have largely from this inſtance proved this book Apocryphal; nor do I know any thing that can be objected againſt the proof, unleſs it be what Baronius and the laſt named writer have ſaid for the credit of the book, *that St. Paul did ſometimes make uſe of teſtimonies from heathen authors*; which, though it be indeed true, yet is very little to the purpoſe, it being one thing *to cite the genuine books of a moral heathen for the ſupport of a moral point*, and another *to make uſe of teſtimonies out of forgeries and ſpurious books, to prove the very foundation of the Chriſtian Revelation*; a method, which though however much practiſed by ſome of the Fathers, eſpecially by Juſtin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Lactantius, is both unjuſt in itſelf, injurious to truth, and derided by their enemies. And hence we find Celſus objects it to Origen[a], *that they had corrupted the books of the Sibylls, by inſerting many things in favour of Chriſtianity*; to which Origen gives a very weak anſwer in my judgment; perhaps, becauſe he would not, or durſt not give a better: and in another place Celſus, with an air of wit, banters the Chriſtians under the name of Sibylliſts[b], and even Lactantius[c] owns, that the Pagans *were wont to object, that the verſes, which the Chriſtians cited under the Sibylls' names, were not really theirs, but forged by the Chriſtians*; and Conſtantine the emperor[d], after he had produced the famous Greek Acroſtick concerning Chriſt, attributed to the Sibyll Erythræa, adds, Οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπιστοῦσι καὶ ταῦθ', ὁμολογοῦντες Ἐρυθραίαν γεγενῆσθαι Σιβύλλαν μάντιν· ὑποπτεύουσι δέ τινα τῶν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας, ποιητικῆς μούσης ἐκ ἄμοιρον, τὰ ἔπη ταῦτα πεποιηκέναι, that *Many men did not believe it, though they confeſs the Sibyll Erythræa to have been really a propheteſs, but ſuppoſe that thoſe verſes were made by ſome one of*

[a] Orig. contr. Celſ. lib. 7. p. 368.
[b] L. 5. p. 272.
[c] De vera Sap. c. 15.
[d] Orat. ad. Sanct. Cæt. c. 19.

our

our religion, who had a genius for poetry, &c. I ſhall conclude this Chapter with the judgment of St. Auſtin in this matter, which not only is a fair intimation of the forgery of the Sibylls, but implies a very ſtrong argument againſt the *Preaching of Peter*. Diſcourſing againſt the Jews, he ſtarts this objection: Perhaps it may be ſaid, *that the Sibylline prophecies are forged by us*; and anſwers, *we have ſufficient prophecies without them in the Jewiſh books:* and in the end of the next Chapter, diſcourſing of thoſe who arrived to the ſaving knowledge of Chriſt, who were not Iſraelites, he mentions only the account in the book of Job, and adds, *That whatever prophecies of others* (viz. among the Heathens, beſides the book of Job) *concerning the grace of God through Jeſus Chriſt are produced, may be thought the compoſures of the Chriſtians; therefore nothing will be more effectual to convince any of the Heathens, or to eſtabliſh the Chriſtians, if they think rightly, than urging thoſe prophecies concerning Chriſt, which are in the books of the Jews*[a].

CHAP. XXXV.

The Preaching of Peter *proved Apocryphal by other Arguments; as, viz. that it contained ſeveral Contradictions and Falſehoods. Inſtances aſſigned of both. How Lactantius cites it. How Clemens Alexandrinus cites it, viz. as a pious Forgery of ſome Chriſtians.*

WHAT has been already ſaid may be thought ſufficient to prove the ſpuriouſneſs of this *Preaching of Peter*; but becauſe it has been ſo highly eſteemed, I ſhall ſubjoin two or three brief arguments more, viz.

Fifthly, I argue the *Preaching of Peter* to be Apocryphal, from that paſſage in it cited by Heracleon, (produced above, Chap. XXXIII. Numb. 2. and more largely by Clemens

[a] De Civit. Dei, lib. 18. c. 46, 47.

Alexan-

Alexandrinus, in the ſame Chapter, Numb. III.) viz. where Peter commands, *that God ſhould not be worſhipped according to the manner of the Jews, who*, ſays he, *worſhip angels and archangels, and the month, and the moon, &c.* This will afford us an undeniable argument againſt this book; to make which appear, I obſerve, that among the Judaiſing Chriſtians, even in the Apoſtolick age, there *was a cuſtom aroſe of paying worſhip or homage to the angels.* This is ſufficiently clear from thoſe obſcure words of St. Paul, Col. ii. 18. *Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility, and worſhipping angels, &c.* where it is plain by the context he was guarding the Coloſſians againſt the inſinuations of the Jews, *about the neceſſity of their worſhip, as to holy days, and new moons, &c.* The foundation of this practice was partly their opinion, that it was too great boldneſs in a creature to approach to his Creator without ſome interceſſor, and partly becauſe the Law was given by angels; now *this practice* the pretended Peter *inveighs againſt*, but therein *contradicts ſome other parts of his book*, wherein, as it appears by the Epiſtle of Peter to James, (Chap. XXXIII. Numb. 1.) *the whole of the Ebionite Scheme was contended for.* I conclude it therefore Apocryphal by Prop. VII. as it contained contradictions.

Farther, the paſſage forbids the *worſhipping of the month and the moon, as the Jews did*, which either means, that the Jews *paid idolatrous worſhip to the moon*, as the Heathens did, or elſe *their appointing their ſeveral feaſts by it*, as they were appointed to do by the Law of Moſes. *If we ſuppoſe the former*, it will prove the book Apocryphal by Prop. VIII. becauſe the Jews about the time of our Saviour were not guilty of any ſuch idolatry; and therefore Peter, who knew them, could not charge them with it: if we ſay the latter, which is indeed moſt probable, becauſe it was their known practice, it will no leſs prove the book Apocryphal, becauſe *then it muſt contradict itſelf*; ſeeing the deſign of the book was to ſupport the obſervation of the Law of Moſes (as appears by *the Epiſtle of Peter to James* juſt now cited), but the deſign of this command is to abrogate them: I ſay therefore, it is to be judged Apocryphal by Prop. VII. as it contained contradictions.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, The ſame character ſeems juſtly to be fixed upon the book from that paſſage cited by Clemens Alexandrinus twice (viz. Chap. XXXIII. Numb. I. and Numb. II.) and by Theodotus, Numb. 4. where Chriſt is called the Νόμος, the Law, *which ſeems to be upon no other account than to eſtabliſh the Ebionite ſcheme of the everlaſting obligation of the Law*, which has been ſhewn to be the intent of this book. Apocryphal therefore by Prop. VIII.

Seventhly, The Author of the book *about Rebaptiſation* (above, Chap. XXXIII. Numb. 7.) has obſerved a very evident contradiction in it, viz. *After the two Apoſtles Peter and Paul had conferred together, and diſputed at Jeruſalem, they afterwards met in the ſame city as much unknown to each other, as if they had never ſeen each other before.* This ſeems either to argue, that both the Apoſtles had memories exceeding treacherous, or elſe ſomething (as the anonymous Author ſays) very abſurd, i. e. contradictious to itſelf, and therefore what proves it Apocryphal by Prop. VII.

Eighthly, The paſſage (Numb. IV. out of Clemens Alexandrinus, above, Chap. XXXIII.) in which is Chriſt's command to his Apoſtles, *not to go out into the world to preach the Goſpel, till after the expiration of twelve years*, will alſo prove it Apocryphal. For though there be another teſtimony to this tradition, viz. Apollonius, a writer of the ſecond century[a], yet it ſeems very contrary, not only to the deſign of the Chriſtian Religion, which was intended to be as diffuſive as poſſible, without any diſtinction of perſons or nations, but alſo to the expreſs teſtimonies of ſeveral of the books now received; as where our Saviour tells the woman of Samaria, *the hour cometh, when ye ſhall neither in this mountain, nor at Jeruſalem, worſhip the Father*, &c. Joh. iv. 21. where he tells his Diſciples, *the Goſpel was to be preached to all the world*, Matt. xxiv. 14. and actually commands them, without any limitation as to time, *to go forth and preach the Goſpel to every*

[a] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 18.

creature,

creature, and to all nations, Mar. xvi. 15. Mat. xxviii. 18. Beſides, if Chriſt did give his Apoſtles any ſuch command, if the *Hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles by Luke* be true, they were diſobedient to it; for it is certain that in much leſs time Peter had his viſion, Churches were planted in Samaria, Antioch, &c. by the preaching of the Apoſtles: and therefore, after ſo much evidence, I may venture to aſſert this a ſpurious account of Chriſt; and conſequently this *Preaching*, which contained it, alſo ſpurious.

I confeſs indeed, the Latin tranſlator of Clemens has given theſe words another turn, and putting no point after the word ἁμαρτίαι, but a full period after the word ἔτη, makes the paſſage to ſpeak thus, *He that will repent and believe on God through my name, his ſins ſhall be pardoned after twelve years.* But this is more abſurd and fooliſh than the former, and therefore I have choſen to follow Dr. Cave's punctuation and tranſlation [a].

Laſtly, I might argue this book not to have been the compoſure of Peter and Paul, from the *great difference there is in the ſtyle of it from the known ſtyle of thoſe two ſacred writers*, and ſo prove it Apocryphal by Prop. XI. but this I ſhall leave to the judgment and diſcretion of the reader, having ſaid ſo much concerning the various ſorts of ſtyles under that Propoſition.

What remains farther is, that I add *ſomething concerning the manner in which Clemens and Lactantius have cited this book.* As to the latter, though he indeed produces a paſſage out of it, *he does not cite it as of any authority, nor in the leaſt intimate that it was wrote by thoſe Apoſtles.* As to the former, though he indeed cite it ſeveral times, which has been made the great argument to ſupport its authority, I ſhall think it ſufficient to obſerve,

1. That *he never does cite it as Scripture, or under that name.*

2. That *it does not follow from a bare citation of it, that he*

[a] Hiſt. Liter. in Petro.

judged

judged it to be the work of thoſe Apoſtles. Why might he not cite it as an Eccleſiaſtical book? I have above proved, that he did in like manner cite a paſſage out of the *Goſpel of the Hebrews*, which yet himſelf rejected as not Canonical; but

3. Suppoſe he did really *appeal to it as a genuine book*, it will be a moſt abſurd inference, *that therefore it was Canonical*; it is at moſt but the teſtimony of one ſingle Father againſt the expreſs teſtimony of many others as good and proper judges as himſelf, as well as againſt a great many ſtrong arguments of its ſpuriouſneſs. But

4. To ſpeak what I really think; *ſince it is certain the firſt Chriſtians did forge ſeveral pious books to gain credit to Chriſtianity*, as for inſtance, *the Verſes of the Sibylls*, *&c.* out of the ſame principle I ſuſpect Clemens made uſe of this book under the *name of Peter*, juſt in the ſame manner as he has very often in his works taken teſtimonies againſt the Pagans out of the ſpurious Verſes of the Sibylls. See p. 17, 32, 41, 223, 304, 323, 601, 604, 636, *&c.*

Upon the whole, I conclude this *Preaching of Peter* to have been the forgery of ſome Ebionites in the beginning of the ſecond century, and contained things vaſtly different from any thing that ever the Apoſtles preached; that it paſſed under various changes, ſuffered many interpolations, and was a moſt ſilly and impious impoſture.

CHAP. XXXVI.

The Revelation of Peter ſuppoſed by Dr. Grabe equal to the Revelation of John; by Mr. Toland, as preferable to Seven Books of our preſent Canon; by Mr. Whiſton, to have been a ſacred Book. Their Opinion of it groundleſs; for Clemens Alexandrinus never cited it. The Book of Hypotypoſes not written by Clemens, but another; proved out of Photius. A conjecture concerning the Hypotypoſes ſupported out of Caſſiodorus. The Excerpta Theodoti not made by Clemens. The Contents of theſe Eclogues, or Excerpta; and their Contrariety to the known Doctrines of Clemens. They were not Part of the Hypotypoſes, as Mr. Valeſius ſuppoſes, nor Part of the Stromata. This fully proved. The Preaching of Peter not eſteemed by Euſebius. He does not contradict himſelf in Relation to that Book, as has been generally ſuppoſed. A Method of clearing him.

Numb. LIII. The REVELATION OF PETER.

BESIDES the *Goſpel*, *Acts*, *Judgment*, and *Preaching*, I obſerve there was alſo extant formerly a Book called, *The Revelation of Peter*. The antient writers who have mentioned it are as follow; viz.

1. Clemens Alexandrinus [a].

There was a book formerly extant under his name, but now loſt, entitled, *The Hypotypoſes of Clemens*; and in this *he made uſe of the Revelation of Peter*, as Euſebius informs us [b].

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ὑποτυπώσεσι πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγο-

In the books of his called *Hypotypoſes*, he has wrote ſome *ſhort Commentaries* upon all the books of Scripture, not

[a] Lib. Hypotypos.

[b] Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 6. c. 14.

omitting

μένας παρελθών· τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω, καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολὰς, τήν τε Βαρνάβα, καὶ τὴν Πέτρε λεγομένην Ἀποκάλυψιν.

omitting even *the controverted books*, I mean that of Jude, and the other Catholick Epiſtles; the Epiſtle of Barnabas, and that called, *The Revelation of Peter.*

2. Theodotus[a].

Διὸ καὶ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει φησὶ, Καὶ ἀστραπὴ πυρὸς πηδῶσα ἀπὸ τῶν βρεφῶν ἐκείνων, καὶ πλήσσουσα τὰς ὀφθαλμὰς τῶν γυναικῶν.

Wherefore Peter in his Revelation ſaith, *And the light of fire darted from theſe infants, and did ſtrike upon the eyes of the women.*

3. By the ſame[b].

Αὐτίκα ὁ Πετρὸς ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει φησὶν, Τὰ βρέφη ἐξαμβλωθέντα τῆς ἀμείνονος ἐσόμενα πείρας, ταῦτα ἀγγέλῳ τιμελέχῳ παραδίδοσθαι, ἵνα γνώσεως μεταλαβόντα, τῆς ἀμείνονος τύχῃ μονῆς, παθόντα ἃ ἂν ἔπαθεν καὶ ἐν σώματι γενόμενα· τὰ δ' ἕτερα μόνης τῆς σωτηρίας τεύξεται, ὡς ἠδικημένα ἐλεηθέντα, καὶ μένει ἄνευ κολάσεως, τῆτο γέρας λαβόντα. Τὸ δὲ γάλα τῶν γυναικῶν ῥέον ἀπὸ τῶν μαστῶν καὶ πηγνύμενον, φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει,

Preſently after, *Peter ſays in his Revelation*, "That abor-
" tive infants are in the moſt
" happy circumſtances, that
" they are committed to a
" guardian angel, by which
" means they are ſo inſtruct-
" ed, as to obtain a more ex-
" cellent manſion, but firſt
" ſuffering what they would
" have ſuffered, if they had
" continued in the body: but
" as for others, they indeed
" find mercy, and obtain man-
" ſions of happineſs for the
" injuries they have ſuffered;
" and thus in this condition
" they ſhall abide without pu-
" niſhment, receiving this for
" their reward. Again, as Peter ſays in his Revelation, the
" milk of women, flowing down from their breaſts, and

[a] Excerpt. ad Calc. Opp. Clem. Alex. p. 806.

[b] Lib. cit. p. 807.

" coagu-

γεννήσει θηρία λεπτὰ σαρκοφάγα, καὶ ἀνατρέχοντα εἰς αὐτὰς, κατεσθίει.

" coagulating, ſhall produce " ſmall carnivorous animals, " which ſhould ruſh back up- " on them, and deſtroy them."

4. By Euſebius [a].

Τὸ λεγόμενον αὐτῷ Κήρυγμα καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Ἀποκάλυψιν ἴσμεν ὅλως ἐν καθολικοῖς οὐ παραδεδομένα· ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων, μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις.

That book, which is called *The Preaching of Peter*, and *The Revelation of Peter*, we know, have not been delivered to us (or eſteemed) as *Canonical books*; inaſmuch as none of the antients, nor any of our eccleſiaſtical writers, have taken teſtimonies out of them.

5. By the ſame [b].

Ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω —— ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου.

The Revelation of Peter is to be ranked among thoſe books, which are ſpurious.

6. By Jerome [c].

Libri autem ejus, e quibus unus Actus inſcribitur—— quartus Apocalypſis, inter Apocryphas Scripturas reputantur.

But the books under the name of Peter, of which one is entitled his Acts, another his Goſpel,—a fourth his *Revelation*, are reckoned among the Apocryphal Scriptures.

This is all that is to be found among the antients relating to this book: there is not much ſaid of it by the moderns; only Dr. Grabe would [d] by no means have it reckoned an heretical book, but *compoſed by the orthodox Chriſtians, and no more liable to ſuſpicion of hereſy on account of its ſtrange doctrines, than the Revelation of John, and therefore that we ſhould not be too free in our conjectures about ſuch antient obſcure*

[a] Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 3.
[b] Cap. 25. ejuſdem libri.
[c] Catal. Viror. illuſtr. in Petro.
[d] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 71, &c.

prophecies

prophecies. The truth is, which I have often thought, this learned Doctor had very much the ſame opinion of theſe books, and ſome, if not all thoſe, of our preſent Canon. Mr. Toland would have it eſteemed as *valuable as ſeven books of our preſent Canon*, (ſee the place above, Chap. XXXIV. Numb. 5.) *by more than a parity of reaſon*, i. e. there are better arguments for this book than thoſe. Mr. Whiſton[a] alſo *recommends it as a ſacred book.*

The ſubſtance, and indeed the whole that is urged for the book is, that it *was made uſe of by Clemens and Theodotus, not rejected by Euſebius*, but ſaid *to be read in all the Churches of Paleſtine.* I ſhall conſider each of theſe diſtinctly, and then proceed to determine concerning the book.

I. As to Clement's uſing this book, I obſerve, that this is founded wholly upon that place of Euſebius, above produced, Numb. 1. viz. where he ſays, that Clemens Alexandrinus in his *Hypotypoſes wrote ſome ſhort notes or commentaries upon all the parts of Scripture, not omitting the controverted books, and among theſe* The Revelation of Peter. But to this I anſwer,

1. That it does not follow, that this book was of any authority, becauſe Clemens did *write ſome ſhort notes upon it.* This he might do in the ſame manner as ſeveral learned men have wrote notes upon the Apocrypha of the Old Teſtament.

2. *Thoſe Hypotypoſes, or this book of Notes upon the whole Scripture, under the name of Clemens*, were not really his, *but the compoſure of ſome impious Heretick.* The book itſelf is now quite loſt, and only ſome few fragments of it preſerved by Euſebius[b] and Photius[c]; but yet I think we want not evidence to make it appear to have been the work not of Clemens, but of a quite different perſon, from the account the learned Photius gives of it. He ſays, it was indeed *an attempt to explain all the parts of Scripture; and though ſometimes he expounded juſtly, yet in other things his interpretations were impious and fabulous:* he aſſerts *matter to be eternal, makes Chriſt a creature, holds the tranſmigration of ſouls, and that there were great numbers of ſurpriſing worlds before Adam was made;*

[a] Eſſay on the Conſtit. p. 24.
[b] Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 12. l. 2. c. 1, 9, 15. l. 6. c. 14.
[c] Cod. cix.

that the Angels had commerce with women, and children by them; that Chriſt was not fleſh, but appeared to be ſo, with a thouſand other ſuch blaſphemies and fooleries, &c. On the account of which this book is not only deſpiſed by the excellent Photius, but rejected. And indeed any one, who has read the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, will eaſily perceive the whole of this book *contrary to the true Clemens, and his principles*; which is alſo obſerved by Photius, cod. cxi. For ſpeaking of his books, called *Stromata*, he remarks, that *though they are not in all reſpects ſound, yet they are not like the* Hypotypoſes, *which* πρὸς πολλὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ διαμάχεται, *contain many things directly oppoſite to theſe.* After reading this, I made no queſtion with myſelf, but theſe commentaries aſcribed to Clemens *were a ſpurious piece*; and was not a little confirmed therein, when I obſerved that great maſter of books, Photius, had entertained the ſame ſuſpicion, and ſeems inclined to believe theſe commentaries were made by τινὸς ἑτέρου τὸ αὐτῷ πρόσωπον ὑποκριθέντος, *by ſome other perſon pretending to be Clemens*; upon which Andreas Schottus, his Scholiaſt, notes, that his conjecture ſeems probable, becauſe the *other parts of the works of Clemens contain ſound doctrine.* I ſhall take it therefore for proved, that theſe *Hypotypoſes*, or Notes upon the Epiſtles, were not written by Clemens, but *ſome ſilly Heretick*; to all which I will ſubjoin a conjecture, which I cannot but think probable, viz. That theſe *ſhort notes, which are publiſhed by Dr. Fell*[a], *under the name of* Clemens Alexandrinus, *upon the firſt Epiſtle of Peter, the Epiſtle of Jude, the firſt and ſecond Epiſtles of John*, were part of theſe old *Hypotypoſes*, that went *under the name of Clemens*, which, if it be right, we ſhall be able to form another very good argument againſt them, viz. that Caſſiodorus[b], who tranſlated them into Latin, ſays, he found *them ſo heterodox, that he thought proper to exclude a very large part of them from his tranſlation.* If then the book of *Hypotypoſes* was not really wrote by Clemens, it is plain, nothing can be hence gathered for the authority of the *Revelation of Peter*, which was made uſe of, or noted upon in it.

[a] In the end of his edition of that little Tract aſcribed to Clemens Alexandrinus, entitled, *Quis Dives ſalvetur?*

[b] Lib. 1. De Inſtitut. Script. divin. apud Rivet. Critic. Sacr. lib. 2. c. 8.

II. As

II. As to this *Revelation* being *cited in the Eclogues of Theodotus*, which are at the end of Clemens Alexandrinus; I think, that as its being cited there will be no credit to it, ſo the fragment there cited will be of itſelf ſufficient to evidence that it was *a moſt egregiouſly ſilly and Apocryphal book.* That it will gain no credit by being cited in theſe Eclogues, or *Excerpta*, is plain; for though they go under the name of Clemens, yet they are not his, nor is he any farther concerned with them than as *a mere abbreviator*; if he *had indeed any concern at all with them*, which I can hardly perſuade myſelf that he had, when I obſerve that the whole deſign of theſe *Eclogæ* is directly oppoſite to all the known books of Clemens; the former *being intended to countenance the errors of Valentinus and Baſilides*, as is well obſerved by Sylburgius, and the learned Archbiſhop Uſher[a]; but the latter, viz. the genuine works of Clemens, in many places are *deſigned to confute the errors of thoſe two Hereticks*[b]; which is, I think, a convictive argument, either that Clemens had no concern in theſe *Eclogæ*, or Abridgment of Theodotus, or at leaſt that he was no favourer of the doctrines therein contained; and conſequently not Clemens Alexandrinus, but Theodotus, and ſome Heretick of his mind, cited this *Revelation of Peter.* And if this be the caſe, I am ſure it will add no credit to this book, that it is here cited, in the judgment of any one that will conſider the wretched principles of that Heretick above produced, near the beginning of Chap. XXXIV. To which now I add theſe farther out of the ſame Eclogue, *That Chriſt was not only made by the Father, but made fleſh at the beginning of the world; that he himſelf had need of redemption, which he obtained by the deſcent of the dove upon him after his baptiſm; that God the Father ſuffered with the Son; yet that the divinity receded from Chriſt before his paſſion, &c.* If ſuch an Author be allowed to have cited the *Revelation of Peter*, it will rather be an evidence againſt, than for its authority. I muſt not leave this head, without obſerving, that *Valeſius*[c] *has imagined*

[a] In a Manuſcript of his, entitled Bibliotheca Theologica, cited by Dr. Cave, Hiſtor. Liter. p. 56.

[b] See eſpecially l. 3, 4.

[c] Annot. in Euſeb. l. 5. c. 11. et l. 6. c. 14.

theſe Excerpta, *or Eclogues, to have been part of the* Hypotypoſes, *or Commentaries, of which I treated in the foregoing ſection*; becauſe the ſame things were contained in both, and the *Revelation of Peter* was made uſe of in both; and becauſe Pantænus, who was the maſter of Clemens, is called by that author of the Eclogues his maſter. To all which I anſwer, that if it ſhould be true, that theſe Eclogues were part of the Commentaries, or *Hypotypoſes*, yet nothing can be gathered thence for the credit of the *Revelation of Peter*, becauſe I have proved even the *Hypotypoſes* not to have been the books of Clemens. Nor are Valeſius's arguments of any weight, ſeeing it is a thing very probable, that theſe two books might be the work of two other ſcholars of Pantænus, who had the ſame principles: beſides, there is an unanſwerable argument againſt his opinion, that the *Hypotypoſes* conſiſted of ſhort notes, or commentaries, upon all the parts of Scripture; but there is not any thing like this to be found in the Eclogues, or *Excerpta Theodoti*. And hence it follows, that the conjecture of Heinſius, concerning theſe *Hypotypoſes*, being a part of the laſt book of the *Stromata*, is alſo entirely groundleſs.

Upon the whole then I conclude, that as Clemens has no where cited the *Revelation of Peter*, ſo neither is it of any credit to it, that Theodotus, or his abbreviator, did.

III. But the main thing that is urged for the *Revelation of Peter*, is, that *Euſebius did not reject it, but places it in the ſame claſs with the Epiſtle of Jude, and the other catholick Epiſtles*. This is urged by Dr. Grabe with a great deal of aſſurance; in which nevertheleſs he is moſt egregiouſly miſtaken, as he is more than once in his judgment on thoſe words of Euſebius; for in both thoſe places where he mentions it, he abſolutely rejects it. (See above in this Chapter, Numb. 4. and Numb. 5.) In the firſt he affirms, *that he certainly knew it was not delivered to the Church as a Canonical or catholick book*; and in the latter he *places it among the worſt ſort of books, which he calls* νόθοις, i. e. ſpurious. That which Euſebius made his rule to judge by, (which is indeed the only rule in the caſe) was *the teſtimony of the antients*, i. e. the tradition of thoſe

thoſe who lived nearer to the time when the books were written. This he urges againſt this book, and ſaith, that it was not delivered as Canonical, and that no eccleſiaſtical writer has taken any teſtimonies out of it. But in this, ſays Mr. Toland[a], Euſebius is *miſtaken*; *for the contrary appears by the teſtimonies marked in the catalogue, which any body may compare with the originals.* Valeſius[b], and after him Father Simon[c], Dr. Grabe[d], and others, go farther, and *charge Euſebius with contradicting himſelf*; becauſe *himſelf*, ſay they, in *another place* (viz. that above, Numb. 1.) *owns, that Clemens Alexandrinus cited it in the book of his Hypotypoſes. Simon indeed attempts to ſay ſomething in favour of Euſebius*, adding, that perhaps *Euſebius only intended, that no eccleſiaſtical author had quoted theſe books as divine and Canonical.* And herein he is followed by Mr. Richardſon, *in his Anſwer to Mr. Toland*, p. 75. But this is not likely, and, I muſt confeſs, is no other than what we commonly call, begging the queſtion. Dr. Grabe accounts for it thus, viz. that *Euſebius in the beginning of his book had not ſufficiently acquainted himſelf with thoſe things, and therefore ſaid, no eccleſiaſtical writer had cited this book; but, upon farther enquiry into the old books, he found his miſtake, and ſo owned what before he denied.* But this is a very precarious and groundleſs ſuppoſition; inaſmuch as it is certain that Euſebius had read the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, and made large uſe even of the *Hypotypoſes* under his name[e], before he had wrote this third book, where he ſays, that no eccleſiaſtical writer took teſtimonies out of this book under the name of *Peter*. Beſides, had Euſebius thus in the ſixth book perceived the miſtake he was guilty of in the third book (which Dr. Grabe ſuppoſes he did), it was eaſy for him to have corrected it, by eraſing what he had wrote falſely in the former place; but he not having done this, I conclude he was of the ſame mind, when he wrote both books. And though upon this hypotheſis it may be thought, that Euſebius is

[a] Amyntor. p. 53, 54.
[b] Annot. in Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.
[c] Sim. Crit. Hiſt. Nov. Teſt. Part I. c. 3. p. 25.
[d] Spicileg. t. 1. p. 57, 58.
[e] Vid. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 1. c. 12. l. 2. c. 1, 9, 15.

chargeable

chargeable with contradiction to himſelf; yet, with ſubmiſſion to theſe learned men, I think the charge moſt unjuſtly laid; for though he ſays, no eccleſiaſtical writer has taken teſtimonies out of the *Revelation of Peter* in one place, he does not ſay that Clemens Alexandrinus did take teſtimonies out of it in another: all that he ſays, is, that he *wrote ſome ſhort notes upon it* (ὑποτετυπωμένας διηγήσεις ποιεῖται), which is a very different thing from μαρτυρίαις συνεχρήσατο, i. e. *taking teſtimonies out of it, or appealing to it as of any authority.* Had the learned writers above-named obſerved this, I am perſuaded Euſebius had not been ſuſpected of a contradiction; after all which I may fairly conclude, there is nothing to be gathered from Euſebius for the credit or authority of *the Revelation of Peter.*

IV. The laſt thing urged for this *Revelation* is, that Sozomen, a writer of the fifth century, ſays, *it was read in ſome churches of Paleſtine once yearly*, viz. the day of Chriſt's Paſſion[a]. Mr. Toland[b] refers to this place of Sozomen in his Catalogue; and Dr. Grabe[c] concludes from it, that *it was not a book of the Hereticks, elſe it would not have thus been read.* But inaſmuch as Sozomen does not mention what *ſort of churches theſe were*, whether of the Hereticks, or Catholicks; it is moſt reaſonable to conclude the former, not only becauſe of the known heterodoxy of the book, but becauſe Sozomen in the very ſame place tells us, that *it was rejected by the antients univerſally, as a ſpurious piece.*

Thus I have largely conſidered this *Revelation* that went under the name of Peter: whether it *was a prophetick book concerning the miſerable ſtate of the Jews, and the ſtate of the Church to the time of Antichriſt*, as Dr. Grabe[d] and Dr. Mill[e] ſuppoſe, I ſhall not now enquire; only obſerve, that it was certainly Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI. I add alſo the IXth, as it contained things *ludicrous and trifling, fabulous and ſilly relations*; of which ſort thoſe are, produced above, Numb. 2, 3. concerning *abortive children, the milk of women producing animals, &c.*

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. c. 19.
[b] Amyntor. p. 23.
[c] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 72.
[d] Lib. cit. p. 74.
[e] Proleg. in Nov. Teſt. §. 135.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVII.

Other Books under the Name of Peter, viz. The Acts of Peter by Leucius Charinus. The Goſpel of Perfection, a Forgery of the Gnoſticks. A Conjecture concerning the Reaſon of the Title, and the Contents of the Book. The Acts of Philip now extant in the Vatican. The Goſpel of Philip. A Fragment of it. Its Contents, and abominable Doctrines. A Miſtake of Mr. Du Pin concerning it.

Numb. LIV. Other BOOKS under the NAME of PETER.

I HAVE given theſe, for method ſake, a diſtinct title, becauſe I find them ſo mentioned by Pope Innocent I[a]. His words are,

Cætera, quæ ſub nomine Matthæi, ſive Jacobi minoris, vel ſub nomine Petri et Joannis, quæ a quodam Leucio ſcripta ſunt —— non ſolum repudianda, verum etiam noveris eſſe damnanda.

But the other books under the name of *Matthew*, or *James the Leſs*, or *under the name of Peter and John*, which were written by one Leucius; know, that they are not only to be rejected, but condemned.

There can be no reaſon to doubt, but theſe were the ſame with thoſe Apocryphal Acts, of which I have largely treated above, as being forged under the Apoſtles' names by Leucius Charinus, as will evidently appear from what is ſaid Chap. XXI. eſpecially from the paſſage of Photius.

Numb. LV. The GOSPEL OF PERFECTION.

THE moſt eminent and known Hereticks among the Chriſtians in the firſt ages were thoſe called *the Gnoſticks*; of whom Irenæus ſays, that *they forged an infinite*

[a] In Decret. ſive Epiſt. ad Exuper. Epiſc. Tholoſ. c. 7.

multitude

multitude of ſpurious and Apocryphal books [a]; and Epiphanius [b], that *they made many Goſpels under the names of the Diſciples.* Among the reſt of their forgeries he mentions *the Goſpel of Perfection* in the following manner [c].

Ἄλλοι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν πάλιν ἐπίπλαστον εἰσάγεσιν ἀγώγιμόν τι ποίημα, ᾧ ποιητεύματι ἐπέθεντο ὄνομα, Εὐαγγέλιον Τελειώσεως τοῦτο φάσκοντες· καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐκ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ πόνθος τελείωσις· πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ τοῦ θανάτου τελείωσις ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ ὑποσπορᾷ τοῦ Διαβόλου ἐμφέρεται.

But others of them produce a certain *ſpurious and ſuppoſitious work*, to which work they have given the name of *the Goſpel of Perfection*; which really is no Goſpel, but the *Perfection of Sorrow:* for all the perfection of death (i.e. of deſtructive doctrine) is contained in that product of the Devil.

It ſeems not difficult, from the *very title* of this ſpurious book, to conjecture concerning the deſign or ſcheme of it. The Gnoſticks, who forged it and uſed it, pretended to a greater *perfection* in knowledge and virtue than all others, and from thence took their very name Γνωστικοὶ; *Gnoſtici propter excellentiam ſapientiæ, ſic ſe appellatos eſſe vel appellari debuiſſe gloriantur, &c.* ſays Auſtin. de Hæreſ. t. 6. n. 6. See alſo Clemens Alexandrinus De Pædagog. l. 1. c. 6. et Stromat. l. 2. p. 398. For the ſame reaſon they called themſelves καθαροὶ, πνευματικοὶ, &c. *pretending to greater ſanctity and perfection of life than all beſides* [d]; making themſelves even wiſer than the Apoſtles, and to have found out *more perfect doctrines*, as Irenæus ſays [e]; and hence they were wont to call Peter and the reſt of the Apoſtles *imperfect*, as we learn from the ſame Father [f]; from all which it may perhaps be a juſt inference, that *this Goſpel had this title of* Perfection, becauſe *it*

[a] Adverſ. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 17.
[b] Ead. Hæreſ. §. 2.
[c] Hæreſ. 26. §. 8.
[d] Vid. Iren. adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 1.
[e] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 2.
[f] Id. l. 3. c. 12.

contained

contained this their more perfect knowledge and great diſcoveries, which they had arrived to above even the Apoſtles, or any other Chriſtians. If this conjecture be juſt, it is ſufficient to prove it Apocryphal, from the deſign of it, by Prop. VIII. But whatever becomes of this conjecture, it was certainly (as Epiphanius calls it) ſpurious and ſuppoſititious, and therefore Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI.

Numb. LVI. The ACTS of PHILIP.

CONCERNING theſe I have met with nothing in the authors of thoſe ages, to which I am confined, beſides their being thus mentioned by Pope Gelaſius, in his Decree:

Actus nomine Philippi apoſtoli Apocryphi.	*The Acts* under the name of *Philip the Apoſtle* are Apocryphal.

Mr. Fabritius[a] has produced a large fragment of theſe Acts out of Anaſtaſius Sinaita, a writer of the ſeventh century; but this being ſo much after my time, I ſhall not tranſcribe it. The ſame learned writer in his third tome of additions to the two former[b] acquaints us, that Papebrochius has publiſhed ſome *Acts under the name of Philip*, and ſaw, but did not think fit to publiſh, ſome *other Acts* under the name of *Philip*, which are in a manuſcript of the Vatican. There being nothing of them extant in the writers of the firſt four centuries, I ſhall not form any other conjecture concerning them, than that they were probably made either by Leucius Charinus, or were an appendage to his work.

Numb. LVII. The GOSPEL of PHILIP.

AMONG the other forgeries of the Gnoſticks, Epiphanius[c] informs us there was one under this name, and adds, that

[a] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſtam. t. 2. p. 806.
[b] Tom. 3. p. 657.
[c] Hæreſ. 26. §. 13.

They

Καταγελῶσι δὲ λοιπὸν τῶν τὴν πολιτείαν ἀσκέντων, καὶ ἁγνείαν, καὶ παρθενίαν, ὡς εἰς μάτην τὸν κάματον ἀναδεδεγμένων. Προσφέρουσι δὲ εἰς ὄνομα Φιλίππε τὰ ἁγίε μαθητὰ εὐαγγέλιον πεπλασμένον, ὅτι φησὶν, Ἀποκάλυψέ μοι ὁ Κύριος, τί τὴν ψυχὴν δεῖ λέγειν, ἐν τῷ ἀνιέναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· καὶ πῶς ἑκάστῃ τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων ἀποκρίνεσθαι. Ὅτι ἐπέγνων ἐμαυτὴν, φησὶ, καὶ συνέλεξα ἐμαυτὴν πανταχόθεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔσπειρα τέκνα τῷ ἄρχοντι, ἀλλὰ ἐξερρίζωσα τὰς ῥίζας αὐτᾶ, καὶ συνέλεξα τὰ μέλη τὰ διεσκορπισμένα, καὶ οἶδά σε τίς εἶ· ἐγὼ γὰρ, φησὶ, τῶν ἄνωθέν εἰμι· καὶ ἕτως φησὶν, ἀπολύεται. Ἐὰν δὲ, φησὶν, εὑρεθῇ γεννήσασα υἱὸν, κατέχεται κάτω, ἕως ἂν τὰ ἴδια τέκνα δυνηθῇ ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ ἀνελκύσαι εἰς ἑαυτήν.

They laugh at the conduct of the Monks, and thoſe who profeſs chaſtity and virginity, as ſubmitting to unneceſſary hardſhips. They produce *a forged Goſpel* under the name of the *Holy Apoſtle Philip*; in which it is written; "The "Lord hath revealed to me "what the ſoul muſt ſay when "it makes its entry into hea- "ven, and what ſort of an- "ſwer it muſt make to each "of the heavenly Powers: "(viz. in the following man- "ner) *I knew myſelf, and* "*gathered*[a], *recollected* (or "guarded) *myſelf on all ſides,* "*and did not raiſe children* "*for the Devil*[b], *but extir-* "*pated all his principles, and* "*I have gathered together* "*(now) the ſcattered mem-* "*bers,* (viz. of the body) "*and I know who thou art,* "*for I am one of the celeſtial* "*number.* And thus, ſays "that book, ſhe is ſet at li- "berty:" but it adds, that if the ſoul be found to have propagated children, it is obliged to ſtay ſo long below, till ſhe ſhall be able to receive and bring thoſe children to herſelf, i. e. till the ſouls of the children depart.

This is a ſufficient taſte of this Goſpel, which I ſuppoſe

[a] I know not how elſe to tranſlate this myſtical paſſage.

[b] So I tranſlate ἄρχοντι, becauſe they ſaid that all procreation was from the Devil.

will

will be but indifferently reliſhed by thoſe, who have any taſte either of religion, or common ſenſe. The book ſeems by this fragment to have been of a piece with the other performances of the Gnoſticks, and as extravagant in its conceits as the Goſpel of Baſilides, Eve, or any of the reſt. It ſeems by this fragment to have been particularly wrote with the view of ſupporting their doctrine of *the unlawfulneſs of procreation*; for though, as in the beginning of this paſſage, they did not forbid the uſe of women, and therefore laughed at the Monks, yet they forbad the procreation of children, and for this purpoſe made uſe of methods ſo very abominable, and prodigiouſly unnatural and vile, that I had rather the reader ſhould be ignorant of them, than be told by me. He who has a mind may read Epiphanius in the place referred to at the bottom of the page[a]. I will only obſerve, that in the place cited, that Father tells us, they had Apocryphal books which ſupported their obſcene doctrines; which farther confirms my conjecture about the contents of this Goſpel. It appears plainly to be Apocryphal, by Prop. IV, V, VI. VIII, and IX. and Mr. Du Pin[b] imagines, it was the ſame with the Goſpel that was made uſe of by the Ebionites, Baſilides, and Apelles; but however juſt his opinion may be, as to the two latter (though there is not, nor does he pretend to offer any reaſon for it), yet ſure I am, he muſt be miſtaken as to the former, ſince the Ebionites entertained no ſuch principles.

[a] Hæreſ. 26. §. 5. c. vi. §. 5. p. 126.
[b] Hiſt. of the Canon, vol. 2.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

The Goſpel of Scythianus. He was the Author of the Manichean Hereſy. The Goſpel of the Simonians. The Revelation of Stephen.

Numb. LVIII. The GOSPEL of SCYTHIANUS.

S.

THIS Goſpel is only conſiderable, becauſe it was compoſed by him who was the ſource and author of the Manichean Hereſy: it is mentioned,

1. By Cyril of Jeruſalem[a].

In a diſcourſe concerning the Hereſy of the Manichees; of which and its riſe (ſeventy years before his writing), as alſo its progreſs, he gives a very particular account; he aſſerts one Scythianus to have been the firſt founder of the ſect.

Σκυθιανός τις ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, Σαρακηνὸς τὸ γένος, οὐδὲν κοινωνὸν, ἔτε πρὸς Ἰουδαϊσμὸν, ἔτε πρὸς Χριστιανισμὸν κεκτημένος. Οὗτος τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν οἰκήσας, καὶ τὸν Ἀριστοτελικὸν μιμησάμενος βίον, τέσσαρας βίβλους συνέταξε, μίαν καλεμένην Εὐαγγέλιον, ἐ Χριστοῦ πράξεις περιέχουσαν, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς μόνον τὴν προσηγορίαν, &c.

There was a certain perſon in Egypt named Scythianus, by nation a Saracen, having nothing common either with the Jewiſh or Chriſtian Religion. When he lived at Alexandria, and conformed himſelf to the rules of life in the *Ariſtotelick Philoſophy*, he compoſed four books; one called *The Goſpel*, not containing any account of the actions of Chriſt, but only taking its title from him, &c.

[a] Catech. vi. c. 13.

2. By

2. By Epiphanius[a].

Ἐν τούτοις γὰρ ὁ προειρημένος Σκυθιανὸς τυφλωθεὶς τὴν διάνοιαν, λαβὼν παρὰ Πυθαγόρᾳ τὰς προφάσεις, ἔτως ἐφρόνησε· καὶ βίβλους τέσσαρας ἑαυτῷ πλάσσεται, τῇ μιᾷ ὄνομα θέμενος Μυστηρίων, τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ Κεφαλαίων, τῇ τρίτῃ Εὐαγγελίε, τῇ τετάρτῃ Θησαυρῶν· ἐν αἷς ἰσόζυγα καὶ τὰ ἰσόῤῥοπα δύο ἀρχῶν συζεύξας πρόσωπα καθ' ἑκάστην ὑπόθεσιν, ἔτως ὑπολαβὼν ὁ τάλας, καὶ ἔτως κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἐφαντάζετο, ὥς τι μέγα εὑρὼν τῷ βίῳ· καὶ τῷ ὄντι μέγα κακὸν εὕρατο τῷ βίῳ, καθ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν πλανωμένων.

Such were the opinions of Scythianus, who was infatuated in his judgment, and borrowed his principles from Pythagoras. Beſides, he compoſed four books; calling one, The Book of Myſteries; the ſecond, The Book of Principles; the third, *The Goſpel*; the fourth, The Book of Treaſures; in which he ſuppoſed two equal principles and perſons united, in every argument; and by theſe notions the wretch thought he had made ſome conſiderable diſcoveries in life; but really he formed that which was very deſtructive to life, both in reſpect of himſelf and thoſe who are deluded into his ſcheme.

There is not any thing more ſaid of this Apocryphal Goſpel by the old writers; nor indeed is there any need of it to prove it Apocryphal: he who will conſider it as one of the firſt books that gave birth to the ſentiments of the Manichees, and knows any thing of that monſtrous hereſy, will eaſily be perſuaded to look upon it as an Apocryphal book, their principles being inconſiſtent with the very foundation of the Chriſtian religion. I reject it therefore by Prop. IV, V, VI, VIII, and IX. The Manichees had ſome other Goſpels, of which perhaps I ſhall ſay ſomething below, Numb. LXV.

[a] Hæreſ. 66. §. 2.

Numb. LIX. The ACTS of the APOSTLES by SELEUCUS.

SELEUCUS (as I have above proved, Chap. XXI.) was only a different name for Leucius; and conſequently theſe are the ſame Acts with thoſe under the name of Leucius Charinus, which have been largely conſidered in that place, and proved Apocryphal, and therefore need no farther diſcuſſion here.

Since the compiling of the Catalogue in the former part of this work, I have obſerved in Dr. Mill an account of the *Goſpel of the Simonians*[a], as mentioned in the *Arabick Preface to the Council of Nice*, which is in Labbé[b]. That I might not omit any thing of this ſort, I here give the reader that learned Doctor's account of it. *The Simonians* (he ſuppoſes) i. e. *the followers of Simon Magus, forged this Goſpel, which, according to the number of our four Goſpels, they divided into four parts; and at length about the time of Irenæus, borrowing a title from the holy Fathers of the Church, who wittily concluded there were four Goſpels, becauſe there were four regions of the world, (or four principal winds*[c]*) they called it*, The Book of the four Corners or Regions of the World. Agreeable to this we read in the book called *The Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles*[d], that *Simon and Cleobius, and their followers, compiled books under the name of Chriſt and of his diſciples, in order to deceive, &c.* It is to be rejected by Prop. IV, V, and VI.

Numb. LX. The REVELATION of STEPHEN.

I HAVE not found this any where beſides in the Decree of Pope Gelaſius thus:

Revelatio, quæ appellatur Stephani, Apocrypha.	The *Revelation* under the name of Stephen is Apocryphal.

Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI.

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 261.

[b] Tom. 2. Concil. p. 386.

[c] This we meet with in Irenæus adv. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 11. and ridiculed by Toland, Amyntor. p. 50, 51.

[d] Lib. 6. c. 16.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXIX.

The Goſpel of Tatian. It was a compendious Harmony of four Goſpels. He ſeems to have made Uſe of the Hebrew Goſpel of Matthew, or the Goſpel of the Nazarenes. This proved by ſeveral Arguments. The Harmony now extant among the Orthodoxographa is not this old one of Tatian. An Account of Tatian, his Works and Principles. The Goſpel of Thaddæus. The Catholick Epiſtle of Themiſon (mentioned by Apollonius). He was a Montaniſt, and lived as early as Montanus. The Time of the Riſe of Montaniſm, about the Year of Chriſt CLXXIV. An Account of that Hereſy. A Digreſſion concerning the Agreement of the Mahometan Scheme with that of the Montaniſts and Manichees. Mr. Toland's Miſtake in this Matter.

Numb. LXI. The GOSPEL of TATIAN.

T.

ALTHOUGH ſeveral antient writers make mention of a work of Tatian, relating to the Goſpels; yet I have cited none of them beſides Euſebius and Epiphanius, becauſe no one elſe entitles his work *a Goſpel*. It is firſt mentioned

By Euſebius[a].

Χρῶνται μὲν ἔν ἔτοι Νόμῳ καὶ Προφήταις, καὶ Εὐαγγελίοις, ἰδίως ἑρμηνεύοντες τῶν ἱερῶν τὰ νοήματα γραφῶν· βλασφημοῦντες δὲ Παῦλον τὸν Ἀποστόλον, ἀθετοῦσιν αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς, μήδε τὰς Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων καταδεχόμενοι.

They (the Encratites or Severians) do make uſe of the Law and the Prophets, and the Goſpels, but expound the ſacred Scriptures according to their own ſentiments. They ſpeak evil of the Apoſtle Paul, and reject his *Epiſtles*; neither do they receive *the Acts*

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 29.

Ὁ μέν τοι γε πρότερος αὐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ὁ Τατιανὸς, συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν ἔκ οἱῦ ὅπως τῶν Εὐαγγελίων συνθεὶς, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν, ὃ καὶ παρά τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται.

of the Apostles. The first author of their sect was Tatian, who made *I know not what sort of a Harmony of the Gospels*, and called it, *The Gospel of the Four*; which is even to this day in the hands of some.

By Epiphanius [a].

Λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπ' αὐτῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ὅπερ κατὰ Ἑβραίας τινὲς καλῦσι.

They say, that the *Gospel of the Four* was made by him (viz. Tatian), which some call, The Gospel according to the Hebrews.

From both these places it is evident, that this composure of Tatian was no other than a *Harmony of four Gospels*; it seems to have been a sort of epitome of the whole history that is in our four Gospels; for Theodoret, a bishop of Cyprus [b], tells us, that *many, not only of the impious sect that followed Tatian, but of the orthodox Christians* (τὴν τῆς συνθήκης κακουργίαν οὐκ ἐγνωκότες, ἀλλ' ἁπλούστερον ὡς συντόμῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ χρησάμενοι) *not perceiving the craft intended in the composure, innocently made use of it as a more compendious volume.* This is sufficient intimation to us, that there were in the work some heretical opinions, or at least what that Bishop thought such. These, if I may conjecture, seem to have been some passages or histories taken out of the Gospel of the *Nazarenes* or *Hebrews*; which I suppose Tatian made use of in compiling his Harmony, as much or perhaps more than the Greek copies of St. Matthew; and this I am inclined to think;

1. Because Epiphanius assures us, *This work of Tatian was called by some* The Gospel of the Hebrews; *and this cannot be supposed to have happened from any other cause more probable.*

[a] Hæres. 46. §. 1. [b] Hæret. Fabul. lib. 1. cap. 20.

I know

I know indeed Valeſius [a], and after him Mr. Fabritius [b], boldly aſſerts, that *Epiphanius was miſtaken, at leaſt that thoſe he ſpeaks of were miſtaken, who ſaid that it was called* The Goſpel of the Hebrews; and the reaſon Valeſius offers is, that *the Goſpel of the Hebrews was much older than Tatian.* But nothing can be more weak than this. Does it follow, that becauſe the Goſpel of the *Hebrews* was before the time of Tatian, that therefore upon Tatian's making uſe of it, and tranſlating a good part of it into his Harmony, his work could not be called by that name? On the contrary, nothing is more probable, than that his work ſhould be thus called, upon that ſuppoſition.

2. I argue it farther as probable, that Tatian made uſe of the *Hebrew* Goſpel, becauſe *as the Genealogy was omitted in that* (ſee above, Chap. XXV. Numb. 11.) ſo *alſo it was in the* Goſpel of Tatian, as is expreſsly teſtified by Theodoret in the place now cited.

3. *Tatian was by birth a Syrian, firſt ſpread his notions in Meſopotamia* [c], and conſequently well knowing, and probably well acquainted with the Goſpel of the *Nazarenes*; as well knowing the language of it, and probably himſelf one of that ſect.

4. Ambroſe, in a paſſage wherein he undoubtedly refers to this *Goſpel of Tatian*, intimates, *that it contained ſeveral heretical and impious things:* many, ſays he, have jumbled into one book thoſe things out of the four Goſpels, which they found agreeable to their malignant principles [d].

If this account be true, we are to conclude it Apocryphal by the ſame arguments (at leaſt many of them) as thoſe by which I proved the *Hebrew* Goſpel of the Ebionites to be ſo above, Chap. XXIX. If it be not true, then it is only to be looked upon as a compoſure out of our preſent Goſpels.

There is indeed now extant among the *Orthodoxographa a*

[a] Annot. in Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 29.

[b] Cod. Apoc. Nov. Teſtam. Par. 1. p. 349.

[c] See what he ſaith of himſelf in the end of his Oratio ad Græcos, at the end of Juſtin Martyr's works, and Epiphan. Hæreſ. 46. §. 2.

[d] Comment. in Luc. 1.

Harmony aſcribed to Tatian; but, as has been well obſerved by ſeveral learned men (Valeſius[a], Fabritius[b], Dr. Mill[c], and others), *it cannot be the ſame* with this, which we are now diſcuſſing, *becauſe it hath the Genealogy* in it, which this had not, as appears from what is above ſaid. I ſhall conclude this ſection with ſome account of Tatian. *He was, after having made a conſiderable figure as a tutor of Oratory, a diſciple of Juſtin Martyr, continuing an ornament to the Church while he lived, but afterwards he fell into hereſy; he wrote a prodigious number of books, of which the moſt valuable one is now extant*, viz. that againſt the Gentiles *at the end of Juſtin Martyr's works.*

Irenæus[d] and Epiphanius[e] add ſome account of his principles, as that *he coincided with the Valentinian doctrine of the Æones, denied the ſalvation of Adam, held all ſorts of marriage unlawful, and as criminal as adultery. He is reported to have adulterated St. Paul's Epiſtles by changing their phraſeology*[f]. He lived in the time of Marcus Antoninus Verus, and Lucius Commodus[g]; but a more particular account of his age may be ſeen in Mr. Dodwell's Diſſertation on Irenæus, iv. §. 32, 33.

Numb. LXII. The GOSPEL of THADDÆUS.

OF this I know no more than that it is mentioned by Pope Gelaſius in his Decree thus:

Evangelium nomine Thaddæi Apoſtoli Apocryphum.	The Goſpel under the name of Thaddæus the Apoſtle is Apocryphal.

To be rejected by Prop. IV, V, and VI.

[a] Loc. jam cit.
[b] Lib. cit. p. 378.
[c] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 351.
[d] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 31. et 3. 39.
[e] Hæreſ. 46. §. 2, 3.
[f] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 29.
[g] Hieronym. Catalog. Viror. illuſtr. in Tatiano.

Numb.

Numb. LXIII. The CATHOLICK EPISTLE of THEMISON.

THE Montaniſts, though a very conſiderable ſect, do not ſeem to have feigned many books for the ſupport of their doctrines. Apollonius, who wrote againſt them, as he ſays, juſt forty years after their riſe, viz. about the year of Chriſt CCXIV, mentions a compoſure of Themiſon, one of their confeſſors, reſembling the Apoſtles. His words are,

Ἔτι δὲ καὶ Θεμίσων ὁ τὴν ἀξιόπιστον πλεονεξίαν ἠμφιεσμένος, ὁ μὴ βασάσας τῆς ὁμολογίας τὸ σημεῖον, ἀλλὰ πλήθει χρημάτων ἀποθέμενος τὰ δεσμά· δέον ἐπὶ τούτῳ ταπεινοφρονεῖν, ὡς μάρτυς καυχώμενος, ἐτόλμησε μιμούμενος τὸν Ἀπόστολον, καθολικήν τινα συνταξάμενος ἐπιστολήν, κατηχεῖν μὲν τοὺς ἄμεινον αὐτῷ πεπιστευκότας· συναγωνίζεσθαι δὲ τοῖς τῆς κενοφωνίας λόγοις· βλασφημῆσαι δὲ εἰς Κύριον καὶ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν Ἐκκλησίαν.

But Themiſon, who was moſt exceſſively covetous, had not the evidences of having been a martyr, but by the abundance of his money purchaſed immunity. And when upon that account he ought rather to have been humble, he exalted himſelf as a martyr, and was ſo impudent as *to imitate the Apoſtle*, and to compoſe a certain *Catholick Epiſtle*, pretending thereby to give inſtruction to thoſe, who were better Chriſtians than himſelf, *and contending for the ridiculous doctrine of the Montaniſts, and ſpeaking evil of our Lord and his Apoſtles, and the Holy Church* [a].

This book appears not only by its pompous title, but the whole deſign of it, *to have pretended to inſpiration*, which was at that time the great ſupport of the Montaniſt hereſy. Of this Themiſon, its author, I find no mention beſides in this place of Euſebius. He lived very near, if not in the time of

[a] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 5. c. 18.

Montanus (viz. the year of Chriſt CLXXIV. according to the Chronicon of Euſebius), becauſe Apollonius, who wrote againſt the Montaniſts, and againſt Themiſon, wrote his book but forty years after the Montaniſt hereſy firſt began (as himſelf ſays [a]). Beſides, it ſeems very probable (as Valeſius has well obſerved [b]) from ſeveral parts of this fragment of Apollonius, that he wrote againſt the Montaniſts, while Montanus and his mad prophets were yet alive; nor does his ſaying he wrote forty years after the riſe of the Montaniſts at all contradict this; for if we ſuppoſe Montanus to have been about thirty years old, when he began his hereſy, he would not have been above ſeventy, when Apollonius wrote againſt him; from which it is evident, this catholick Epiſtle was forged in imitation of the Apoſtles, at the riſe of Montaniſm, conſequently, as Apollonius ſays, to *ſupport that ridiculous ſcheme*, and therefore a book falſely pretending to inſpiration. So that however this Epiſtle was eſteemed by the Chriſtians of that ſect, it muſt certainly be Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI. as alſo by Prop. VIII. as *containing things contrary to known truths, and deſtructive of the firſt principles of Chriſtianity*; as will appear to any one who will be at the pains to read the account given of this ſect by Apollinaris Hierapolitanus [c], Apollonius [d], Serapion [e], Epiphanius [f], and many others of the antients; and to thoſe who will not, if they conſider that Montanus *pretended to deal much with a dæmon, by whoſe influence he fell into ſtrange ecſtatick fits and raptures, which he afterwards communicated to two ſhe-prophets, who, as all his*

[a] Apud Euſeb. loc. cit.

[b] Annot. in loc. cit. Euſeb. I obſerve, that Epiphanius, expoſing the Montaniſts, becauſe their pretended prophecies were not accompliſhed, (Hær. 48. §. 2.) adds, *that from the time of their being given out to the time of his writing, which*, ſays he, was in the twelfth year of Valentinian and Gratian, *there had paſſed* ἔτη πλείω ἢ ἐλάσσω διακόσια ἐνενήκοντα; i. e. *about* 290 *years*: but in this either Epiphanius was miſtaken, or his copies are corrupt; for the twelfth year of Valentinian anſwering to the year CCCLXXV of Chriſt, and the Montaniſt hereſy not ariſing till the year CLXXIV, there could at moſt be, between the birth of this hereſy and his writing, but 201 years; and therefore I ſuppoſe ſome fault to have happened through the careleſſneſs of ſome ſcribe in Epiphanius.

[c] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 16.

[d] Apud Euſeb. l. 5. c. 18.

[e] Apud eund. l. 5. c. 19.

[f] Hæreſ. 48.

followers

followers taught by him, acknowledged him to be the Paraclete, or Comforter promiſed by our Saviour. (John xiv. 16.) In this he was followed by Terebinthus, afterwards called Manes, the head or father of the Manichees, who called himſelf the *Paraclete* promiſed by our Saviour, as St. Cyril[a], Epiphanius[b], and many others aſſure us; and this I mention by the by, to propoſe, for farther diſcuſſion, an opinion which I have long had, that *the Mahometan ſcheme was very much founded upon, or gathered from, the impious, ridiculous tenets of the Montaniſts, or Manichees, or both*; ſeeing it is a thing certain and well known, that Mahomet's followers, among other titles, give him that of *Paraclete*, which is the Greek word uſed by St. John for the *Comforter*, made Arabick, as Dean Prideaux has well obſerved[c], and not taken from *any word in that language*, which ſignifies famous, or illuſtrious, as Mr. Toland, with as much ignorance as malice, ſuggeſts[d]. It is true, the Mahometans pretend, that the *very name of Mahomet*, both here, and in other places of the Goſpel, *was expreſsly mentioned*, but that the *Chriſtians, out of malice, have blotted it out, and corrupted thoſe holy writings; and that at Paris there is a copy of theſe Goſpels, without theſe corruptions, in which the coming of Mahomet is foretold in ſeveral places, with his name expreſsly mentioned in them*[e]: but nothing can be more ridiculous than Mr. Toland's account of this matter, viz. that the Mahometans maintain that the original was *Periclyte*, ſignifying *famous*, i. e. in Arabick, *Mohammed*, and not *Paraclete*; for beſides, that there is no word like that in Arabick, which ſignifies *famous*, and anſwers to *Mohammed* (which Dr. Mangey challenges him to prove[f], and he durſt not attempt, but intolerably ſhuffles over in his anſwer[g]), the fact is notoriouſly falſe; the Mahometans, as has been ſaid, laying their charge, in this reſpect, in another and more conſiſtent manner, than he, with all his ſkill, was able to do for them.

[a] Catech. vi. c. 14.
[b] Hæreſ. 66. §. 12.
[c] Life of Mahomet, in the end.
[d] Nazaren. p. 13.
[e] See Dean Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, in the end.
[f] Remarks on Nazarenus, c. 6. p. 35.
[g] Mangoneutes, p. 181.

But

But though Mr. Toland be ſo wretchedly miſtaken here, yet he again repeats his invidious inſinuation, p. 16. *The Muſſulmans accuſe our Goſpels of corruption in the 16th and 26th verſes of the fourteenth chapter of John.* But why Goſpels? as though the accuſation extended to all the four; when it only, at moſt, affects the Goſpel of John? The fact in ſhort is no more than this. Mahomet in the *ſixty-firſt chapter* of his Alcoran hath theſe words: "*Remember that Jeſus the ſon of* "*Mary ſaid to the children of Iſrael: I am the meſſenger of* "*God; he hath ſent me to confirm the Old Teſtament, and to* "*declare unto you, that there ſhall come after me a prophet,* "*whoſe name ſhall be Mahomet.*" On this account his followers found it neceſſary to charge corruption on our Goſpels in the manner aboveſaid [a].

I hope this digreſſion may not be unſerviceable, nor the hint above-mentioned of the agreement between the Mahometans and Montaniſts.

CHAP. XL.

The Acts of Thomas. Not the ſame with thoſe made by Leucius Charinus, but much older. A Manuſcript in the French King's Library under the Title of the Acts of Thomas. Another under the ſame Title in the Bodleian at Oxford. The Goſpel of Thomas. There were undoubtedly two Goſpels under this Name. The Revelation of Thomas. Books under his Name.

Numb. LXIV. The ACTS of THOMAS.

THESE Apocryphal Acts are mentioned by ſeveral of the antients, particularly,

[a] Thus well reaſons the learned Dean in the place cited.

1. By

1. By Epiphanius [a].

Κέχρηνται δὲ γραφαῖς πρωτοτύπως ταῖς λεγομέναις Ανδρέα καὶ Ἰωάννα Πράξεσι, καὶ Θωμᾶ, καὶ ἀποκρύφοις τισί, &c.

They, *i. e.* the Encratites, principally make use of those Scriptures, which are called, *The Acts of Andrew* and *John*, and *Thomas*, and *some other Apocryphal Books*, &c.

2. By the same [b].

Οὗτοι δὲ ταῖς λεγομέναις Πράξεσιν Ἀνδρέα τε καὶ Θωμᾶ τὸ πλεῖον ἐπερείδονται, παντάπασιν ἀλλότριοι τῆ κανόνος τῆ Ἐκκλησιαστικῆ ὑπάρχοντες.

They, *i. e.* the Apostolicks, chiefly depend upon those Scriptures which were called *The Acts of Andrew* and *Thomas*, *altogether departing from the Canon of the Church.*

3. By Athanasius [c].

Τὰ τῆς νέας διαθήκης ἀντιλεγόμενα ταῦτα, περίοδοι Πέτρε, περίοδοι Ἰωάννε, περίοδοι Θωμᾶ, &c.

The Apocryphal Books of the New Testament are these, *The Acts of Peter*, *The Acts of John*, The Acts of Thomas, &c.

4. By Gelasius in his Decree.

Actus nomine Thomæ Apostoli Apocryphi.

The Acts under the name of *Thomas the Apostle* are Apocryphal.

There appears no small difficulty in determining exactly concerning these Acts. It is certain that there was a book of *Acts of the Apostles*, of which I have above treated, Chap. XXI. composed by Leucius Charinus, containing the Acts not only of Peter, John, Andrew, and Paul, but also of Thomas; and hence Mr. Fabritius [d], Dr Mill [e], &c. have thought

[a] Hæres. 47. §. 1.
[b] Hæres. 61. §. 1.
[c] In Synops. versus fin. See the place at large above, Chap. XXI.
[d] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Testam. tom. 2. p. 823.
[e] Prolegom. in Nov. Testam. §. 338.

the

the *Acts of Thomas*, wherever they are mentioned, to be the same book; but herein I suppose they are mistaken, because these *Acts of Thomas* are mentioned by Epiphanius, as being used by *some sects of the Gnosticks*, viz. *the Encratites and Apostolicks*, who arose from *Tatian in the second century*, even before Irenæus, and consequently *long before the time of Leucius*, who lived (as has been proved) in the *latter end of the third, or beginning of the fourth century*. And though I have above said, Chap. V. Numb. 1. that it is probable the Encratites and Manichees *made use of the same Acts*, whence it would seem to follow, that they were the same with those made by Leucius, because his were in great request among the Manichees; yet this difficulty is easily answered, by supposing that Leucius, who was a Manichee, did *so largely interpolate them, or so much alter them*, that they were afterwards called by his name. They are however plainly Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, and VI. There are indeed *some large accounts of Thomas* in Austin's works [a], which are thought to be taken out of these Acts; but inasmuch as these Acts are not expressly mentioned, they do not properly fall under my consideration; but may perhaps be produced in a more convenient place in the next volume, where I shall consider these Acts as a book now extant, seeing Father Simon affirms, there is such a book in the French King's Library, and Dr. Grabe [b] says that he met with it in our Bodleian.

Numb. LXV. The GOSPEL of THOMAS.

THERE is at this day extant a Gospel under the name of *Thomas*, otherwise intitled *The Gospel of the Infancy of our Saviour*, which I shall in the next part of this work insert; but it being very uncertain whether it be the same with this antient one, I shall here produce the places where this is mentioned within my time, without any regard to that. It is mentioned,

[a] Lib. adv. Adimant. Manich. t. 6. c. 17. contr. Faust. Manich. lib. 22. c. 79.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 324.

1. By

1. By Origen [a].

Ecclesia quatuor habet Evangelia, Hereses plurima;—— Scio Evangelium, quod appellatur Secundum Thomam, &c.,

The Church receives only four Gospels, the Hereticks have many;——I know one intitled, *The Gospel of Thomas*, &c.

2. By Eusebius [b].

Ἵν' εἰδέναι ἔχοιμεν—τὰς ὑπὸ ὀνόματι τῶν Ἀποστόλων πρὸς τῶν Αἱρετικῶν προσφερομένας, ἤτοι ὡς Πέτρᾳ καὶ Θωμᾷ—Εὐαγγέλια, &c.

That we may know the books published by the Hereticks under the Apostles' names, *such as the Gospels of Peter, Thomas*, &c.

3. By Cyril [c].

After having given a complete catalogue of the Books of the Old Testament, and of the New, which is exactly agreeable to our present Canon, except that the Revelation is omitted, he adds,

Τῆς δὲ καινῆς διαθήκης τὰ τέσσαρα Εὐαγγέλια· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ψευδεπίγραφα καὶ βλαβερὰ τυγχάνει. Ἔγραψαν καὶ Μανιχαῖοι κατὰ Θωμᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον, ὅπερ ὥσπερ εὐωδίᾳ τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς προσωνυμίας διαφθείρει τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἁπλουστέρων.

There are but four Gospels belonging to the New Testament; the rest are falsely so called, and hurtful. *The Manichees also have wrote a Gospel* according to Thomas, *which passing under the specious title of a Gospel, corrupts the minds of the weaker (Christians).*

4. By the same [d].

Μηδεὶς ἀναγινωσκέτω τὸ κατὰ Θωμᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν

Let no one read the *Gospel according to Thomas*; for it is

[a] Homil. in Luc. 1. See the place at large above, Chap. VII. Numb. V.

[b] Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25. See the passage at large above, Chap. XXI.

[c] Catech. IV. c. 22.

[d] Catech. VI. c. 18.

not

ἑνὸς τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων, ἀλλ' ἑνὸς τῶν κακῶν τριῶν τῶ Μάνη μαθητῶν.

not the Goſpel of one of the Twelve Apoſtles, but one of the three wicked Diſciples of Manes (whoſe name was Thomas).

5. By Ambroſe [a].

Multi Evangelia ſcribere conati ſunt, quæ boni Numularii non probaverunt——— Fertur Evangelium, quod ſcribitur Secundum Thomam, &c.

Many have attempted to write Goſpels, which the Catholick Church has not approved———There is one ſpread abroad, which is intitled *The Goſpel according to Thomas.*

6. By Athanaſius [b].

Τὰ τῆς νέας διαθήκης ἀντιλεγόμενα ταῦτα——Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Θωμᾶ, &c.

The Apocryphal Books of the New Teſtament are theſe—*The Goſpel of Thomas*, &c.

7. By Jerome [c].

Plures fuiſſe qui Evangelia ſcripſerunt, Lucas Evangeliſta teſtatur, dicens, Quoniam quidem multi, &c. quæ a diverſis auctoribus edita diverſarum hæreſeωn fuere principia, ut eſt illud juxta Ægyptios et Thomam, &c.

Luke the Evangeliſt aſſures us, *there were many who wrote Goſpels* (ch. i. 1.) which being publiſhed by various authors gave birth to various hereſies; ſuch is that *According to the Egyptians and Thomas*, &c.

8. By Gelaſius in his Decree.

Evangelium nomine Thomæ Apoſtoli, quo utuntur Manichæi, Apocryphum.

The Goſpel under the name of Thomas the Apoſtle, which the Manichees uſe, is Apocryphal.

[a] Comment. in Luc. i. See the paſſage at large, Chap. VII. Numb. V.

[b] In Synopſ. See the paſſage at large above, Chap. XXI.

[c] Præfat. in Comment. in Matth. See the place at large above, Chap. VII. Numb. IV.

I need

I need ſay no more of this book, than that it appears plainly to have been a ſpurious piece, compoſed by the Hereticks, and Apocryphal by Prop. IV, V, VI; only I muſt obſerve, that the *Goſpel of Thomas*, of which Cyril ſpeaks, compoſed by Thomas, one of the followers of Manes, the head of the Manichees, could not poſſibly be the ſame with that mentioned by Origen, and perhaps moſt of the other writers, except Gelaſius; becauſe Origen lived a conſiderable time before the Manichean hereſy, or even Manes himſelf was known in the world: this being not till the *latter end of the third century*, viz. till the time of Aurelius Probus, or Diocleſian (as I have above obſerved, Chap. XXI.), whereas Origen *lived in the beginning of it.*

Numb. LXVI. The REVELATION of THOMAS.

IT is only mentioned by Gelaſius in his Decree.

Revelatio, quæ appellatur Thomæ Apoſtoli, Apocrypha.	The Revelation, which is aſcribed to Thomas the Apoſtle, is Apocryphal.

To be rejected by Prop. IV, V, and VI.

Numb. LXVII. BOOKS under the NAME of THOMAS.

By Innocent I. [a]

Cætera, quæ ſub nomine Matthæi——et ſub nomine Thomæ——non ſolum repudianda, verum etiam noveris eſſe damnanda.	The other books under the name of Matthew——or the name of Thomas,——know, that they are not only to be rejected, but condemned.

It is not very certain what books under this Apoſtle's name this Pope here deſigned to condemn; it is probable they were

[a] In Decret. ſive Epiſt. 3. ad Exuper. Epiſcop. Toloſ. c. 7.

not

not the *Acts*, becauſe he would have attributed them to Leucius, whom he juſt before refers to, as the author of ſpurious acts under the names of Peter and John, and others, as has been proved, Chap. XXI. I ſuppoſe therefore he rather intended the Goſpel of Thomas.

CHAP. XLI.

The Goſpel of Truth, a Forgery of the Valentinians. Some Account of Valentinus. A Goſpel under his Name.

Numb. LXVIII. The GOSPEL of TRUTH.

THIS book was undoubtedly a compoſure of the ſecond century, and very early therein it is mentioned by Irenæus [a] thus:

His igitur ſic ſe habentibus, vani omnes et indocti, et inſuper audaces, qui fruſtrantur ſpeciem Evangelii [b], et vel plures quam dictæ ſunt, vel rurſus pauciores inferunt perſonas Evangelii——Hi vero qui ſunt a Valentino, iterum exiſtentes extra omnem timorem, ſuas conſcriptiones proferentes, plura habere gloriantur, quam ſint ipſa Evangelia; ſiquidem in tantum proceſſerunt audaciæ, uti quod ab his non olim conſcriptum eſt, Veritatis Evangelium ti-

Seeing theſe things are ſo (viz. that there are but four Goſpels), it follows, that they are all ſilly and ignorant, as well as impudent, who attempt to make any alteration in the Goſpels, and make the authors of the Goſpels to be either *more or fewer* (than four).. But the Valentinians, without any modeſty, producing ſome writings of their own, boaſt that they have more than the (four) Goſpels; for they have been ſo very impudent, that they have

[a] Adverſ. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 11. ad fin.

[b] This paſſage is not intelligible, without conſidering his preceding allegory of the four Goſpels, and four animals.

intitled

tulent, in nihilo conveniens Apoſtolorum Evangeliis, ut nec Evangelium quidem ſit apud eos ſine blaſphemia. Si enim, quod ab iis profertur, Veritatis eſt Evangelium, diſſimile eſt autem hoc illis, quæ ab Apoſtolis nobis tradita ſunt; qui volunt poſſunt diſcere, quemadmodum ex ipſis Scripturis oſtenditur, jam non eſſe id quod ab Apoſtolis traditum eſt Veritatis Evangelium. Quoniam autem ſola illa vera et firma, et non capit neque plura præterquam prædicta ſunt, neque pauciora eſſe Evangelia, per tot et tanta oſtendimus.

intitled one, *The Goſpel of Truth*, which was not long ſince written by them, nor does in any thing agree with the Goſpels of the Apoſtles; ſo that they have really no Goſpel but a mere forgery [a]; for if that Goſpel which they produce, intitled *The Goſpel of Truth*, be diſagreeable to thoſe which have been delivered to us by the Apoſtles; every one may perceive (as has been proved above from the Scriptures) that *the Goſpel of Truth* is not one of thoſe delivered by the Apoſtles. Beſides that I have above by ſeveral good arguments evinced, that only the (four) above mentioned Goſpels are true and juſt, and to be received.

This paſſage leaves us no room to doubt concerning the deſign and ſcope of this Goſpel, being calculated to ſerve the purpoſes of the *Valentinian ſcheme*. The author of the ſect, Valentinus, was at Rome under Hyginus, about the year of Chriſt 142 (according to the Chronicon of Euſebius), but according to the opinion of ſome modern criticks, near twenty years ſooner; which indeed ſeems to me undeniably demonſtrated by ſeveral good arguments by our learned Biſhop Pearſon [b]. He was one of the *principal authors of the Gnoſticks*; and of his ſentiments we have a very particular account given us by Irenæus [c], Clemens Alexandrinus [d], Tertullian [e], Ori-

[a] So I tranſlate the word *Blaſphemia*, becauſe it at leaſt implies ſome injuſtice done to the Apoſtles.

[b] Vindic. Epiſt. Ignat. par. 2. c. 7.

[c] Lib. 1 et 2. adv. Hæreſ.

[d] Strom. lib. 3.

[e] De Præſcript. adv. Hæretic. c. 49. et Lib. adv. Valentin.

gen [a], Epiphanius [b], and ſeveral others, which I ſhall not here largely enumerate, but only give the reader the following ſpecimen. *Having been educated in the Platonick philoſophy at Alexandria, he formed his notions of Chriſtianity agreeable thereto. He imagined certain gods, which he called Æones, to the number of thirty, whoſe names and pedigree* (conformable to the fabulous genealogies of Heſiod) *he pretended to aſſign. Fifteen of them he would have to be male, and fifteen female.* Epiphanius has preſerved their names; they are ſuch as theſe, Ampſiu, Auraan, Bucua, Thartua, Ubucua, Thardeadie, &c. *That Chriſt brought a body with him from heaven, and paſſed through the Virgin as water through a pipe. He aſſerted the lawfulneſs of all ſorts of luſts to his Diſciples,* allowing *them to force other men's wives,* &c. *denied the reſurrection, contended for the tranſmigration of ſouls,* &c. Such were very probably the contents of this Goſpel, ſo pompouſly intitled, *The Goſpel of Truth.* To be rejected therefore by Prop. IV, V, VI, VIII, and IX.

Numb. LXIX. The GOSPEL of VALENTINUS.

IT is only mentioned by Tertullian thus [c]:

Evangelium habet etiam ſuum præter hæc noſtra.	Valentinus alſo *has a Goſpel of his own,* beſides theſe of ours.

This book, intitled *The Goſpel of Valentinus,* has been ſuppoſed by ſome learned men to have been no other than the *Goſpel of Truth,* made uſe of and forged by the Valentinians, of which I treated in the laſt ſection. This is ſuppoſed by Dr. Grabe [d], and after him by Mr. Fabritius [e], becauſe, as they imagine, *Valentinus himſelf did not write any Goſpel.* This they gather from a paſſage of Tertullian [f], which to me

[a] Contra Celſ. lib. 2. p. 77. lib. 5. p. 274. eſpecially l. 6. p. 298. et Expoſ. in Rom. l. 8. c. 11.
[b] Hæreſ. 31.
[c] De Præſcript. adv. Hæret. cap. 49.
[d] Spicileg. Patr. t. 2. p. 48, 49.
[e] Fabrit. Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſt. par. 1. p. 380.
[f] Lib. jam cit. c. 38.

ſeems

ſeems to imply no ſuch thing: His words are, " Alius manu " Scripturas, alius ſenſu expoſitiones intervertit. Neque " enim ſi Valentinus integro inſtrumento uti videtur, non " callidiore ingenio quam Marcion manus intulit veritati. " Marcion enim exerte et palam machæra non ſtylo uſus eſt; " quoniam ad materiam ſuam cædem Scripturarum confecit. " Valentinus autem pepercit; quoniam non ad materiam " Scripturas, ſed ad Scripturas materiam excogitavit." i. e. *Some hereticks corrupt the Scripture with their hands* (viz. by adding and taking out); *others do it by perverſe interpretations. For though Valentinus ſeems to make uſe of all the Scriptures, he no leſs artfully than Marcion made his attacks upon the truth. For Marcion corrupted not only ſmall portions of Scripture, but made almoſt a total deſtruction, deſigning thereby to make the Scriptures accommodate to his principles: but Valentinus ſpared them, becauſe his deſign was not to accommodate the Scriptures to his principles, but his principles to the Scriptures.* In this paſſage it is plain, that Tertullian ſays no more, than that *Valentinus did not corrupt the ſacred volume as Marcion did*, by taking out thoſe things which were diſagreeable to his opinions; *he ſays not* (as theſe learned men imagine) *that Valentinus made no new Goſpel*; nor is the ſuppoſition of his having made one in the leaſt inconſiſtent with the deſign of this paſſage; which ſhews the weakneſs of Dr. Grabe's argument, *that the latter part of this book under the name of Tertullian is not his*, becauſe the author ſays, Valentinus had a Goſpel, and ſo contradicts this former part of it, where he ſays he had not one; Tertullian ſaying no ſuch thing. But if there really were any contradiction in theſe two places of Tertullian, I ſhould rather think *the miſtake was in the former*, where he ſays, Valentinus did not corrupt the Scriptures, than *in the latter*, where he ſays, Valentinus had a Goſpel of his own; becauſe I obſerve, that both Irenæus [a] and Origen [b] lay the former crime, viz. of corrupting the Scriptures, to the charge of that heretick, though the latter, much more plainly than the former; for when Celſus objects, that ſome Chriſti-

[a] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 1. [b] Contr. Celſ. l. 2. p. 77.

ans had changed the firſt Scriptures three or four times, or more, &c. Origen anſwers, that this was not done by any perſons except the Diſciples of Marcion, and Valentinus, and Lucianus. I conclude therefore, that Valentinus had a Goſpel of his own, and that this was different from that called *the Goſpel of Truth* made uſe of by his followers; becauſe the one was uſed, and ſo probably forged by Valentinus, but the *other* more lately made by his followers; yet it is very probable they were both deſigned for the ſame purpoſes, and therefore both by the ſame reaſon to be eſteemed Apocryphal, by Prop. IV, V, VI, VIII, and IX.

AN

AN

APPENDIX;

CONTAINING

AN ACCOUNT

OF ALL THE

SAYINGS AND HISTORIES

OF

CHRIST,

WHICH ARE TO BE FOUND IN THE WRITERS OF THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A Collection of the DISCOURSES, HISTORIES, &c. of CHRIST and his APOSTLES, which are to be found in the Alcoran of MAHOMET.

ALTHOUGH I cannot but hope, that I have in the foregoing part of this work ſufficiently diſproved the claim of any of the *loſt books* under the name of Chriſt, his Apoſtles, &c. *whoſe names are yet preſerved*, to Canonical authority; yet I judged it neceſſary to add the following Appendix: the deſign of which will be evident from what follows.

Beſides the Apocryphal Goſpels, *whoſe names are ſtill extant*, and of which I have produced all the remaining Fragments, it has been thought, and may ſeem probable, that there have been ſeveral others, *whoſe names are now quite loſt*; be-

cauſe there are cited in the writings of the primitive Fathers ſeveral *ſayings* and *hiſtories* of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, *which are not to be found in any of our preſent Goſpels.* Now inaſmuch as theſe are generally ſuppoſed to *be taken out of Apocryphal Goſpels* by ſeveral learned men, ſuch as Mr. Dodwell, Dr. Mill, Dr. Grabe, Mr. Fabritius, and others, as will appear in the ſequel of this diſcourſe: what I propoſe here is, *to make as large a collection as I can* of all thoſe *Accounts, Sayings, Hiſtories, Doctrines, &c.* of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, which are not in any of our preſent Goſpels, *but either are, or may be ſuppoſed to have been taken out of ſome Apocryphal books, and which are mentioned by any writer of the firſt four centuries after Chriſt*; and withal to make it appear, that *none of theſe accounts were taken out of Apocryphal books.* And as in this laborious attempt I propoſed the eſtabliſhing the credit of our preſent Canon, ſo alſo the entertainment of the curious in Chriſtian antiquities. The reader learned in theſe things will eaſily obſerve, that there are many accounts of the Apoſtles omitted in this collection, that are in the writings of the firſt four centuries; but I deſire it may be conſidered, that theſe are purpoſely omitted here, becauſe I take in none but ſuch as may, or have been ſuppoſed to, have been in ſome Apocryphal books; whereas theſe are generally traditions not written, and of which perhaps hereafter, in a more convenient place, I may make a full collection.

Two or three things I muſt premiſe to this work; viz.

I. That I do not propoſe *to tranſcribe the various lections of our Goſpels, that are to be gathered out of the writings of the Fathers, nor to make thoſe paſs for ſayings of Chriſt, different from any in our Goſpels, which are only the* memoriter *citations of the antient writers.* To do this would be a work of endleſs trouble, and of very little advantage; and I cannot but think the labours of Dr. Mill in his collections of this ſort were very triflingly employed, as Dr. Whitby[a] has ſufficiently ſhewn. It is a matter paſt all doubt, that all the primitive writers cited

[a] Examen variant. Lection. Mill. ſect. i—vi.

the

the Scripture *memoriter*, or by *memory*, without conſulting their copies; which is not at all ſtrange, if we conſider the forms of their volumes, being large ſkins of parchment rolled up together (as I have elſewhere ſhewn [a]), and that their books were not divided into chapters and verſes, as ours now are. Hence I ſay, they cited *memoriter* frequently, and conſequently expreſſed rather *the ſenſe and meaning*, than *the words* of the author they cite; (1.) Sometimes *quite changing his words, and ſubſtituting thoſe of their own, which they thought equivalent*; (2.) Sometimes *inſerting their own gloſſes and explications, and what they imagined needful to make the ſenſe of the ſentence complete*; (3.) Sometimes *leaving out what was not to their purpoſe*; *and* nothing more commonly, than (4.) *joining ſeveral different texts of Scripture together, and which are related by ſeveral Evangeliſts, as though ſpoken by Chriſt at one time.* All this it were eaſy to demonſtrate by a thouſand inſtances; and beſides, the fact being ſo notorious, I ſhall here take it for granted: he who has a mind may ſee very many examples of all theſe, collected by the learned Heinſius [b] and Dr. Whitby, in the place cited.

II. I purpoſe not to *collect the differences of antient manuſcripts*, nor to lay down, as *ſayings* or *hiſtories* of Chriſt, any of thoſe which are to be found in any manuſcripts now extant, and not in our preſent Goſpels, unleſs perhaps in one or two inſtances, where the difference will appear to have been in manuſcripts before the end of the fourth century. This I propoſe not here, becauſe it is a work rather belonging to the integrity of the text, than the eſtabliſhment of the Canon.

III. I premiſe it as very probable, that *many accounts and ſayings of our Saviour were conveyed by tradition through the firſt and ſecond centuries.* St. John tells us [c], that our Saviour did many other things, which, *if they ſhould be written every one, he ſuppoſes, that even the world itſelf would not contain the books which ſhould be written.* Some of theſe it is impoſſible,

[a] Vindic. of Matthew, chap. xv. Nov. Teſt. p. 4, 5, &c.
[b] Prolegom. in Exercit. Sacr. ad [c] Joh. xxi. 25.

in the nature of things, but muſt be tranſmitted to the ſucceeding ages; eſpecially if we conſider, how remarkable our Saviour's *ſayings* and actions were, and how much taken notice of. Theſe Papias, Irenæus, and many others ſought after; and indeed we can hardly ſuppoſe any one of ſo little curioſity, as not to deſire the knowledge of them, and conſequently of theſe it is very probable ſeveral are to be found in the moſt antient monuments of Chriſtianity.

Theſe things premiſed, I come to conſider the paſſages themſelves, which are in the antient writers, relating to Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and which not being to be found in any of our Goſpels, are or may be ſuſpected to be taken out of ſome others.

[*N. B. I ſhall produce theſe paſſages* according to the order of time, *in which the writers are ſuppoſed to have lived, who mention them.*]

I. *A* Saying *of Chriſt mentioned by St. Paul, Acts* xx. 35. *not to be found in any of our Goſpels.*

Πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὕτω κοπιῶντας δεῖ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων, μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε, Μακάριόν ἐστι διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν.

I have ſhewed you all things, how that ſo labouring you ought to ſupport the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jeſus, how he ſaid, *It is more bleſſed to give than to receive.*

This ſaying of Chriſt has been ſuppoſed by ſome to *be taken out of ſome Apocryphal Goſpel now loſt* [a]; by others, to be taken out of a book entitled, *The Book of the Sayings of Chriſt*, which is cited in *The Recognitions of Clemens* [b]; and by Turrianus [c], to be taken out of the *Conſtitutions of the Apo-*

[a] Vid. Heinſ. Exercit. Sacr. in Act. xx. 35.

[b] Sixt. Senenſ. Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 2. p. 130. ad Voc. Verborum Dom. Lib.

[c] Præfat. in Conſtit. Apoſtol.

ſtles,

ſtles, for which opinion he alſo cites Euthalius, a biſhop cotemporary with Athanaſius: but there is not the leaſt evidence for the truth of either of theſe opinions, becauſe had St. Paul really cited any book, he would, according to his cuſtom, have given ſome intimation that he did ſo, either by *mentioning the author's name*, or *the title of the book*, &c. Beſides, as to the firſt of theſe opinions, it has not the leaſt appearance of truth; and as to the two latter, I ſhall think it enough at preſent to ſay, the books, from whence the paſſage is ſuppoſed to be cited, were made long after St. Paul's time. Neither of theſe conjectures being probable, ſeveral learned men, as Beza [a], Chemnitius [b], Heinſius [c], &c. have thought that the Apoſtle does not refer to any particular ſaying of Chriſt, but *to ſeveral of our Lord's ſayings in the Goſpels, which he intended to compriſe or abridge in this*; ſuch as that, Matt. xix. 21. that Luke xvi. 9. and the parable of the talents, Matt. xxv. But this opinion ſeems very improbable, becauſe the Apoſtle expreſsly refers to the very words of Chriſt, and ſays not only λόγων τῦ Κυρίε Ἰησῦ, but αὐτὸς εἶπε. That which ſeems therefore moſt likely, is, *that Paul received this paſſage by tradition* from the Apoſtles, or Diſciples of Chriſt, with whom it is certain he frequently converſed, and from whom he received many accounts of fact; and perhaps it is not unlikely he was then told it, when he went up to Jeruſalem from Antioch, with the charitable collections of the Chriſtians there for the indigent brethren at Jeruſalem, Acts xi. 30.

II. *A* Saying *in the Epiſtle of Barnabas, Chap.* IV. *aſcribed to Chriſt.*

Sicut dicit Filius Dei, *Reſiſtamus omni iniquitati, et odio habeamus eam.*

As the Son of God ſaith, *Let us reſiſt all iniquity, and hate it.*

[a] Annot. in loc.
[b] Exam. Conc. Trid. Par. I. p. 40.
[c] Loc. jam cit.

III. *A* Say-

III. *A* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt in the ſame Epiſtle, Chap.* VII.

Οὕτω, φησὶν, οἱ θέλοντές με ἰδεῖν, καὶ ἅψασθαί μου τῆς βασιλείας, ὀφείλουσι θλιβέντες καὶ πολλὰ παθόντες λαβεῖν με.

So they, ſaith Jeſus, *who would ſee me, and arrive to my kingdom, muſt receive me through the ſuffering of many troubles and afflictions.*

The celebrated Archbiſhop Uſher [a] imagines it an evidence of the great antiquity of this Epiſtle under the name of Barnabas, that in it are cited ſeveral of the Apocryphal books, the very names of which are now quite loſt. Mr. Dodwell [b] aſſerts not only of Barnabas, but Clemens Romanus, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, the ſuppoſed writers of the firſt century, or Apoſtolick age, that they promiſcuouſly made uſe of our Goſpels and other Apocryphal books. Dr. Mill follows him exactly, and is ſomewhat more ſanguine in his expreſſions [c]. *They,* i. e. *the Apoſtolick Fathers,* ſays he, *cite and alledge, without any difference, the Apocryphal Goſpels and the inſpired books of the Apoſtles.* One would imagine they had very clear proof for the ſupport of theſe aſſertions, and that Barnabas, Clemens, Hermas, Polycarp, and the reſt, had named, or at leaſt referred to ſome ſuch writings, or books. But of this I dare aver, there is not one ſingle inſtance in all thoſe Fathers to be found; and though ſome of them have ſome paſſages not in our Goſpels, yet there is not any reaſon to conclude they were taken out of others, as I ſhall ſhew in the particular examination of them: and firſt as to thoſe of Barnabas, which are now under conſideration, only firſt obſerving that Mr. Fabritius [d] ſuppoſes alſo that both theſe paſſages were taken out of ſome Apocryphal Goſpel. I ſhall conſider each of them diſtinctly.

[a] See the remaining part of the preface to an edition of this Epiſtle, which he intended to have publiſhed, but was conſumed at Oxford, with all his notes, only a few in the Corrector's hand, by the great fire there, 1643. See the Preface to Dr. Fell's Edition.

[b] Diſſert. I. in Iren. §. 29.

[c] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 144, &c.

[d] Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Teſt. Par. 1. p. 330, 331.

As

As to the firſt, it is evident it could not poſſibly be any *ſaying* of Chriſt, becauſe *it is delivered in the plural number*, LET Us reſiſt all iniquity, and let Us hate it. Theſe, I ſay, could not be the words of Chriſt, becauſe *his commands are never delivered in the plural number*, as relating to himſelf and to his Apoſtles; beſides, it is abſurd in the nature of the thing for a perſon under the character of Chriſt to *command himſelf*, eſpecially conſidering that he *was incapable of all ſin*. If therefore they were not the words of Chriſt, it is plain they are no more than the author's explication of ſome words of his; and though he prefix the words, *Sic dicit Filius Dei, ſo ſays the ſon of God*; it is plain that they cannot be taken in their literal ſenſe, but muſt mean, *This is the command of Chriſt to us*, or *he has ſpoken to this purpoſe*, that we ſhould avoid and hate all ſin; or *it is the doctrine which he has delivered*[a]: and ſo indeed it is in many parts of our Goſpels, and the main deſign of them all, and therefore was not taken out of any Apocryphal book.

As to the latter paſſage, it was either *taken out of that paſſage of Paul and Barnabas*, Acts xiv. 22. where it is ſaid they exhorted the churches *to continue in the faith*, and ſay, *we muſt all, through much tribulation, enter into the kingdom of heaven*: which are very near the ſame words with thoſe of the ſuppoſed Barnabas under conſideration, and ſo that is falſely aſcribed to Chriſt, which was ſaid by Paul and Barnabas; or elſe *the paſſage is an alluſion to ſeveral places of our Lord's diſcourſes*, in which he aſſures his followers, that, in order to become his true diſciples, they muſt depend upon a variety of troubles and ſufferings, as he does Matt. x. 18, 22. Luke xiv. 27. John xvi. 33. and in ſeveral other places; and this I ſuppoſe no one can think improbable, who conſiders how frequent theſe ſort of citations are in the writings of the Fathers, and particularly in this Epiſtle.

But if after all it ſhould be thought, theſe paſſages in the Epiſtle of Barnabas were taken out of ſome Apocryphal Goſpel; I will add, that ſeeing it is no hard taſk to prove (as I

[a] See inſtances of the like ſort of ſpeech in Heinſ. Exercit. Sacr. in Act. xx. 35.

hope

hope fully in the next Part of this work to do) that this Epiſtle was not the compoſure of Barnabas, but of ſome other perſon under his name, the credit of our Canon cannot thereby be hurt; for the moſt that can follow from thence is, that the *Apocryphal books have been cited by ſome heretical impoſtor of the ſecond century.*

It will not be foreign to my purpoſe to inſert here, that the Author of this Epiſtle under the name of Barnabas ſaith, ch. v. that when Chriſt choſe his Apoſtles, he made choice of ſuch ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους, *who were exceeding great ſinners:* which, though it be not aſſerted in either of our Goſpels, yet ſeems to be collected from thence, viz. where *Matthew is ſaid to be a publican,* Matt. ix. 9, 10. *Peter deſires Chriſt to depart from him, becauſe he was a ſinful man,* Luke v. 8. and where he is related *to have denied Chriſt,* Matt. xxvi. 70, &c. Paul ſtyles himſelf *a perſecutor and blaſphemer, and the chief of ſinners,* 1 Tim. i. 13, 15. This is well obſerved by Origen againſt Celſus to have been the meaning of Barnabas in this place[a], though Jerome[b], by miſtake, aſcribes this to Ignatius, and not to Barnabas.

IV. *A* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt in the ſecond Epiſtle of Clemens to the Corinthians, Chap.* IV.

He is ſuppoſed to have been the ſame Clemens, who is mentioned by St. Paul, as his fellow-labourer, Phil. iv. 3.

1. Διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἡμῶν πραασσόντων εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· Ἐὰν ἦτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου, καὶ μὴ ποιῆτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν· Ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, πόθεν ἐστέ, ἐργάται ἀνομίας.

1. For this reaſon, that we might do theſe things, the Lord hath ſaid, *Though ye ſhould be joined to me even in my boſom, and do not obſerve my commandments, I will reject you, and ſay to you, Depart from me, I know not whence ye are, ye workers of iniquity.*

[a] Orig. contr. Celſ. lib. 1. p. 49.

[b] Lib. 3. adv. Pelag. c. 1.

V. *An-*

V. *Another* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt and Peter, in the ſame Epiſtle, Chap.* V.

2. Λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος· Ἔσεσθε ὡς ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· Ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία; Εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά· καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός.

2. For the Lord ſaith, *Ye ſhall be as lambs in the midſt of wolves:* but Peter replying, ſaid, *What if the wolves ſhould tear in pieces the lambs?* Jeſus ſaid unto Peter, *Let not the lambs fear the wolves after death, and do not ye fear thoſe who (can) kill you, and (afterwards) can do you no harm; but fear him who has power after your death, to caſt both ſoul and body into hell fire.*

VI. *Another* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt, in the ſame Epiſtle, Chap.* VIII.

3. Λέγει γὰρ Κύριος ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ· Εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ, καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστιν.

3. For the Lord ſaith in the Goſpel, *Unleſs ye have kept that which is little, who will give you that which is great? For I ſay unto you, that he who is faithful in that which is leaſt, is alſo faithful in that which is much.*

VII. *Another* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt, in the end of the ſame Chapter.*

4. Ἆρα οὖν τοῦτο λέγει· Τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἁγνὴν, καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον, ἵνα τὴν ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἀπολάβητε.

4. This therefore is what [the Lord] ſaith, *Keep your fleſh chaſte, and your ſeal* (i.e. baptiſm) *undefiled, that ſo ye may obtain everlaſting life.*

VIII. *An-*

VIII. *Another* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt, in the end of that Epiſtle.*

5. Ἐπερωτηθεὶς αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ὑπό τινος, Πότε ἥξει αὐτῷ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν· Ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω, καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ.

5. The Lord himſelf being aſked by a certain perſon, when his kingdom ſhould come? replied, *When two ſhall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female.*

The conſideration of theſe, or ſome of theſe paſſages, influenced Mr. Dodwell and Dr. Mill to aſſert as above, that Clemens and the other Apoſtolical Fathers promiſcuouſly and indifferently made uſe of ours and other Apocryphal Goſpels. "*Clemens*, ſays Dr. Mill[a], *both in his former Epiſtle to the* "*Corinthians, and the fragment of his ſecond Epiſtle to them,* "*(if it be his) takes ſome teſtimonies out of thoſe Goſpels, which* "*were in uſe among the Chriſtians before the publiſhing of our* "*preſent Goſpels, and ſome, as it ſeems, out of ours, but in a* "*mixed, confuſed manner, &c.*" But as in this *latter aſſertion* he and the learned writer, whom he follows, are moſt apparently miſtaken, each of the Apoſtolical Fathers having plainly made uſe of our Goſpels (as I hope to ſhew hereafter), ſo *alſo in the former*, as will appear by a particular criticiſm on the paſſages here produced, which muſt be thoſe which he refers to, there being no other in the Epiſtle that can be ſuppoſed to be taken out of Apocryphal books. And whereas the Dr. aſſerts, that Clemens in his former Epiſtle to the Corinthians cites Apocryphal Goſpels, he is moſt notoriouſly miſtaken; *there being not one paſſage in that whole Epiſtle, that with any reaſon can be ſuppoſed, or I believe ever has been ſuppoſed to have been alledged out of ſuch books.*

But as to the paſſages in the ſecond Epiſtle here produced of which I have collected five:

The firſt, which is in Chap. IV. appears moſt plainly to

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſt. §. 139.

be

be taken out of St. Luke's Goſpel, ch. xiii. 25, 26, 27. The latter part of the paſſage is in almoſt the very ſame words, and perfectly the ſame ſenſe, in ver. 27. and the former part is no leſs evidently a contraction of ver. 25, 26. and a very common way of citing in the writings of the Fathers. There is no need therefore to ſuppoſe this taken out of any Apocryphal Goſpel; and I cannot but obſerve, that Dr. Mill himſelf in another part of his work, viz. in his note on this place of Luke (forgetful of what he ſays in his *Prolegomena*) *produces this paſſage out of Clemens, and ſuppoſes it to have been taken either out of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, or Egyptians, and to have been taken into one of thoſe Goſpels out of this place of St. Luke, and by thoſe who took it thence corrupted and interpolated.* If we lay his thoughts together, they are theſe: Clemens Romanus took this paſſage out of ſome Apocryphal Goſpel made before any of the preſent Canonical ones: this Goſpel was either that of the Nazarenes, or Egyptians; for theſe were made before any of ours [a], yet this very paſſage was taken out of St. Luke's Goſpel, and inſerted into one of theſe; i. e. in ſhort, St. Luke's Goſpel was made before the Goſpel of the Egyptians and Nazarenes, and the Goſpel of the Egyptians and Nazarenes was made before St. Luke's Goſpel. *Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.*

The ſecond paſſage, viz. that Chap. V. (as to the words of Chriſt) is related in the ſame words by St. Matthew, chap. x. 16, 26, 28. and St. Luke, chap. x. 3. and chap. xii. 4, 5. Wherefore we have no need to ſuppoſe Clemens to have taken it out of any Apocryphal Goſpel: and though indeed there be an inſertion in it of a queſtion propoſed by Peter to Chriſt, viz. *What if the wolves ſhould tear in pieces the lambs?* To which our Lord is made to reply, *Fear not, &c.* This ſeems to have been a groundleſs tradition (of which there were great numbers in that time), becauſe, by a little reflection on the ſeries of our Lord's diſcourſe, in the places now cited of Matthew and Luke, there will ſeem to have been no ſign of an interruption in it, nor indeed well could be. The learned

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſt. §. 35. 38.

Cote-

Cotelerius[a] therefore had no ground to ſuppoſe this taken by Clemens out of an Apocryphal Goſpel.

The third of theſe paſſages is in part alſo cited by Irenæus thus[b]:

Et ideo Dominus dicebat ingratis exiſtentibus in eum; *Si in modico fideles non fuiſtis, quod magnum eſt quis dabit vobis?*

Wherefore the Lord ſaid to thoſe, who were ungrateful to him, *If ye have not been faithful in that which is little, who will give you that which is great?*

Dr. Grabe in his notes on this place conjectures, *that Irenæus tranſcribed theſe words out of the Goſpel of the Egyptians*; but this is a mere groundleſs conjecture. Dr. Mill[c] goes farther, and ſuppoſes the paſſage *to have been originally in ſome Apocryphal Goſpel, which was publiſhed before ours, and conſequently that Clemens, who lived, according to him, before the ſettling of the Canon, took it out of that*; but as to Irenæus, he ſuppoſes indeed he *read it in his copy of Luke*, chap. xvi. 10. *&c.* but *that it was not any part of St. Luke's writing, but an interpolation or inſertion into the copies of that Goſpel, taken out of ſome Apocryphal one, which had this parable of the unjuſt ſteward more at large than it was related by Luke, and being from thence firſt inſerted by ſome curious perſon into the margin of St. Luke, was afterwards, by ſome careleſs ſcribe, transferred into the text or body of the book.* But for all this bold conjecture, there is not the leaſt evidence produced. The caſe is plain; the latter part of the paſſage under conſideration is in ſo many words in our preſent copies of St. Luke, chap. xvi. 10. and the whole meaning of the former part in the next verſe. The words in Clemens are, *If ye have not kept that which is little, who will give you that which is great?* The words in Luke are, *If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your truſt the true riches?* i. e. as is very plain by the whole deſign of the pa-

[a] Annot. in loc.

[b] Adv. Hæreſ. lib. 2. c. 64.

[c] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 374.

rable,

rable, *If you have not been faithful, and made a due uſe of the leſſer enjoyments of this life, who will entruſt you, or how can you expect the greater things and enjoyments of the other*[a]? There is no need therefore of ſuppoſing either any Apocryphal Goſpel, or interpolated copy, out of which Clemens or Irenæus took theſe words. If there were, we may as well ſuppoſe the ſame in ten thouſand inſtances at leaſt, where the Fathers have thus laxly made their citations out of the books of the Old and New Teſtaments. And whereas it may be objected, and perhaps be thought ſtrange, that Clemens and Irenæus *ſhould agree to paraphraſe, or expreſs, our Saviour's words ſo near the ſame:* I anſwer, that it was hardly probable they ſhould have paraphraſed them any other way, becauſe Chriſt himſelf gives the ſame explication of them, ver. 10. and ſo our beſt Paraphraſts and Expoſitors have done.

As to the fourth paſſage, although Dr. Grabe[b], and Mr. Fabritius[c] have imagined it to be *a diſtinct Saying of Chriſt*; and the latter ſays, it was *taken out of an Apocryphal Goſpel*, which he conjectures to be *the Goſpel of the Egyptians*, it appears to me plainly to be *only the words of Clemens, or the Author of the Epiſtle*, in explaining the preceding ſaying of Chriſt; as any one may perceive by the context; and accordingly was taken by the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury in his Engliſh tranſlation, though either his Grace, or his printer, was very much miſtaken, in putting the word *ſoul*, for the Greek σφραγίδα; which word, by the way, is a good evidence that this could not be any Saying of Chriſt, who never made uſe of this word to denote *baptiſm*, which even according to Mr. Fabritius in this place it does; and perhaps an evidence, that this Epiſtle under the name of Clemens was not written by him, or any other perſon of his time.

The laſt paſſage was indeed in the Goſpel of the Egyptians; for Julius Caſſianus urges it thence, as we read in Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. lib. 3. p. 465. and accordingly I have produced it above in the ſecond Part of this work, Chap. XVI.

[a] See Grotius, Hammond, Whitby, Le Clerc, &c.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 13.

[c] Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Teſt. Par. 1. p. 333.

where I have largely proved that Goſpel to be Apocryphal, and a very ſilly forgery; and for this reaſon we have ſufficient ground to reject it, as not really one of our Saviour's, eſpecially when we conſider how unlike it is to the known ſtyle and manner of his ſpeaking; for as I have elſewhere ſaid, that was perfectly clear, eaſy, and familiar; this is myſtical, involved, perplexed, if not abſurd and obſcene, more like the ſilly ambiguous anſwers of the Delphick Oracles, than the rational and plain diſcourſes of Jeſus Chriſt. What remains here is only to enquire, whether this Goſpel was cited in this Epiſtle under the name of Clemens, or this paſſage taken out of it? Which is not very evident, as I conclude,

1. From the manner in which the author introduces the paſſage, Ἐπερωτηθεὶς αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ὑπό τινος, i. e. The Lord himſelf being aſked by a *certain perſon*, &c. which words imply that hew as utterly ignorant, who the perſon was that aſked our Saviour the queſtion: but had he really cited, or made uſe of this Goſpel, he could not have been ignorant, ſeeing it was there expreſsly ſaid, *that Salome was the perſon who aſked the queſtion*; as is evident from the place juſt now cited in Clemens Alexandrinus.

2. The ſaying or paſſage itſelf *is ſuch, as can hardly be imagined to be cited or tranſcribed by a perſon of the worth and character of Clemens, St. Paul's companion*; it is not likely that he ſhould have any regard to a book ſo ſilly, impious, and ridiculous, as the Goſpel of the Egyptians has been proved to be; beſides, if it was an impoſture, he cannot be ſuppoſed to be ignorant of it: once more, as the paſſage itſelf is abſurd and fooliſh, I conclude, he would never have urged it as the words of Chriſt. If therefore this Epiſtle was really wrote by Clemens, I think it very evident, that this paſſage was interpolated, or perhaps rather added to the end of it; for they are the laſt words of the Epiſtle, and an imperfect ſentence, making, as the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury ſays [a], *an*

[a] Preliminary Diſcourſe to his Tranſlation of the Apoſtolick Fathers, p. 129.

abrupt

abrupt concluſion: and this is the more probable, becauſe the Epiſtle ends perfectly and juſtly at the cloſe of the eleventh Chapter. Nor are ſuch corruptions uncommon in the writings of the Fathers, of which Mr. Daillé has obſerved many inſtances [a]; and among which thoſe, who contend for the genuine antiquity of the firſt Epiſtle of Clemens to the Corinthians, are willing to reckon that part of it [b], where Danae and Dirce, *two noted names among the antient Heathen poets, are introduced among the Chriſtian ſufferers.*

3. Upon the whole, I look upon this Epiſtle *not to be the writing of Clemens, but ſome one after his time*, and accordingly we find it rejected, as ſpurious, by Euſebius [c], Jerome [d], Photius [e], and others, of which I ſhall treat more largely hereafter. So that if really any Apocryphal Goſpel was cited in it, it will be no way detrimental to the credit of our preſent Canon.

I only add, that even the paſſage itſelf now under conſideration, if it really was taken out of the Goſpel of the Egyptians, by the author of the Epiſtle, ſeems no mean argument to prove the Epiſtle itſelf not to be written by Clemens; for as it is unlikely that Clemens ſhould cite ſo ſilly a book as this Goſpel was, ſo much more ſo, that he ſhould cite this paſſage, the apparent deſign of which, and indeed, as far as we know, of the whole Goſpel (as has been above ſhewn, Chap. XVI. of this Part), is to celebrate perpetual virginity, and the unlawfulneſs of marriage; a doctrine which, however careſſed by the pretended ſucceſſors of Clemens in the Chair of Rome, I believe, was never contended for by the true Clement, who was the companion of St. Paul, but a notion eſpouſed by the Hereticks, againſt which St. Paul himſelf more than once has wrote. See 1 Tim. iv. 3. and Coloſſ. ii. 21.

Beſides Barnabas and Clemens Romanus, Mr. Dodwell and Dr. Mill aſſert (as above) that Ignatius, Hermas, and Polycarp, have *made uſe of the Apocryphal Goſpels in common with thoſe now received*; but in theſe inſtances they are more egre-

[a] See his right uſe of the Fathers.
[b] Chap. VI.
[c] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 38.
[d] Catalog. Vir. illuſtr. in Clem.
[e] Biblioth. Cod. 126.

giouſly miſtaken than in the former; for as to Hermas and Polycarp, I do affirm, there is not in their writings one paſſage different from our preſent Goſpels; nor have either of theſe writers, or any other (that I know) produced ſo much as one example; and as to Ignatius, though there be indeed in his Epiſtle to the Smyrnæans, c. 3. a *Saying* aſcribed to Chriſt, which is ſuppoſed by Jerome and many later writers to be taken out of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes (which I have above produced, Chap. XXVII. of this Part), yet I have there proved the contrary, and that the paſſage was not taken out of any Apocryphal Goſpel; but out of that of St. Luke xxiv. 39.

IX. *A* Hiſtory *of a Woman accuſed before our Saviour of many Crimes, which was expounded by Papias.* *See* Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 39.

THIS Papias was, as I have above ſhewn, a diſciple of St. John, and an acquaintance of Polycarp. See Ch. XXVII. of this Part.

What this Hiſtory was, we are not now certain. That which makes it conſiderable here is, that Euſebius ſays, *it was in the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, though (as I have largely proved in the place of this work laſt cited) Papias did not take it thence; to which I here add, that it has been thought by ſeveral learned men, that it is no other than the *hiſtory of the adulterous woman, which is in St. John's Goſpel*, ch. viii. 1, &c. So Eraſmus [a], Sixtus Senenſis [b], Beza [c], Grotius [d], Father Simon [e], Dr. Hammond [f], and many others; and indeed the opinion is ſo probable, that I have not met with any thing that is urged againſt it, except that the woman mentioned by Papias was accuſed before our Saviour *of many crimes* (ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης) but the woman mentioned by St. John is *only accuſed of adultery*. This is urged

[a] Annot. in Joh. viii. 3.
[b] Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 7. p. 599.
[c] Annot. in Joh. vii. 53.
[d] Annot. in Luc.
[e] Critic. Hiſtor. of the New Teſt. par. 1. c. 7. p. 67 & 71.
[f] Annot. in Joh. vii. 53.

by

by Baronius [a], and Dr. Whitby [b]; the latter of whom, for this reaſon, ſuppoſes, that Papias *ſpeaks of the woman of Samaria; who*, ſaith he, *was accuſed of many ſuch ſins.* But to this it is eaſy to anſwer: either,

1. That the Evangeliſts do not *always relate all the circumſtances of a ſtory*, as is well known; and ſo perhaps the woman might be accuſed of ſome other crimes, which St. John has not mentioned: or,

2. *Adultery being a complicated crime, which included ſeveral others*, might be very juſtly thus expreſſed by Papias in his Commentaries: or,

3. Perhaps it may not be an unjuſt tranſlation, if we render πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις *great ſins*, rather than *many ſins*; and in this ſenſe the words might be very juſtly uſed for the crime of adultery; and that the word πολὺς is thus often uſed to denote *magnitude*, as well as *multitude*, I dare affirm, and am able to prove by many inſtances. However,

4. Nothing can be more extravagant than Dr. Whitby's conjecture, that *the woman ſpoken of by Papias, and that of Samaria, were the ſame*, becauſe, ſays he, they were *both accuſed of many crimes*; for it does not appear, that the woman of Samaria was ever accuſed before Chriſt of any crimes at all. See the Hiſtory, Joh. iv.

Upon the whole I conclude, that the ſame hiſtory which was written by John was expounded by Papias; whence there is farther evidence of that which I have above proved (Chap. XXVII.), that Papias did not uſe the Goſpel of the Nazarenes.

Whether this hiſtory of the adulterous woman, in the eighth chapter of St. John, be *a genuine part of his writing, or an interpolation out of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*, I ſhall not take upon me here to enquire; that queſtion belonging rather to the text, than the Canon of the New Teſtament. It is certain that it is wanting in the Syriack Verſion, and moſt antient manuſcripts; of which ſee above, Chap. XVII.

[a] Annal. ad Ann. Chr. 99. N. 9. apud Simon. Loc. cit.

[b] Annot. in Joh. viii. 9.

and Dr. Mill's Notes on the place. He who has a mind to read more on this may conſult Eraſmus, Grotius, Beza, Simon, Hammond, Whitby, and eſpecially Dr. Mill, in the places above cited.

X. *A* Diſcourſe *aſcribed to Chriſt by Papias, and ſome others, who converſed with St. John the Apoſtle, preſerved in Irenæus adv. Hæreſ. lib.* 5. *cap.* 33.

Prædicta itaque benedictio ad tempora regni ſine contradictione pertinet, quando regnabunt juſti ſurgentes a mortuis: quando et creatura renovata et liberata multitudinem fructificabit univerſæ eſcæ, ex rore cœli et ex fertilitate terræ: quemadmodum Preſbyteri meminerunt, qui Joannem Diſcipulum Domini viderunt, audiſſe ſe ab eo, quemadmodum de temporibus illis docebat Dominus, et dicebat: Venient dies, in quibus vineæ naſcentur, ſingulæ decem millia palmitum habentes, et in uno palmite dena millia brachiorum, et in uno vero palmite dena millia flagellorum, et in unoquoque flagello dena millia botruum, et in unoquoque botro dena millia acinorum, et unumThe aforementioned bleſſing (viz. the bleſſing of Iſaac on his ſon Jacob, Gen. xxvii. 27, 28.) undoubtedly relates to the times of that kingdom, in which the righteous ſhall reign after their reſurrection from the dead; when the creature being made new, and delivered from bondage (ſee Rom. viii. 21, &c.), ſhall produce prodigious quantities of all ſorts of food, through the dews of heaven and the fruitfulneſs of the earth. Agreeable to which the Elders, who ſaw John the Diſciple of our Lord, have related, that they heard him declare what the Lord ſaid concerning thoſe times, viz. That he ſaid (the following words), *The days will come, in which there will ſpring up vines, each of which ſhall have ten thouſand branches, and every one of theſe branches ſhall have ten thouſand leſſer branches, and every one of theſe branches ſhall have ten thouſand twigs, and every one of theſe twigs ſhall have ten thouſand cluſters of grapes, and every cluſter of grapes ſhall have*

quodque acinum expreſſum dabit viginti quinque metretas vini. Et cum eorum apprehenderit aliquis ſanctorum botrum, alius clamabit: Botrus ego melior ſum, me ſume; per me Dominum benedic. Similiter et granum tritici decem millia ſpicarum generaturum, et unamquamque ſpicam habituram decem millia granorum, et unumquodque granum quinque bilibres ſimilæ claræ mundæ; et reliqua autem poma et ſemina, et herbam ſecundum congruentiam iis conſequentem: et omnia animalia iis cibis utentia quæ a terra accipiuntur, pacifica et conſentanea invicem fieri, ſubjecta hominibus cum omni ſubjectione.

have ten thouſand grapes, and every grape, when it is preſſed, ſhall yield five and twenty meaſures [a] *of wine; and when any of the Saints ſhall lay hold upon one of theſe cluſters, another ſhall cry out, I am a better cluſter than thee, take me, and by me bleſs the Lord; in like manner, one grain of wheat ſhall bring forth ten thouſand ears, and every ear ſhall have ten thouſand grains, and every grain ſhall yield ten pound of neat meal, and in a like proportion to theſe ſhall be the product of apples and ſeeds, and herbs according to their kinds, and alſo all animals, who feed upon theſe foods, which are the produce of the earth, ſhall be peaceable, agreeing with each other, and in a moſt perfect ſubjection to men.*

Theſe things, ſays Irenæus [b], are related by Papias, a hearer of John, and acquaintance of Polycarp, in the fourth book of his work.

XI. *Another* Hiſtory *and* Saying *of Chriſt, in the ſame place of the ſame author.*

Et adjecit dicens, Hæc autem credibilia ſunt credentibus. Et Juda, inquit, proditore non

And he farther adds (viz. Papias), ſaying; but Judas, ſays he, who betrayed him, did not

[a] The word Metretas is uſed Joh. ii. 6. and contained at leaſt 180 gallons of wine. See Godwin's Moſes and Aaron.

[b] Loc. jam cit.

credente, et interrogante; *Quomodo ergo tales genituræ a Domino perficientur?* dixiſſe Dominum, *Videbunt qui venient in illa.*

believe theſe things, but enquired, *How the Lord could bring about ſuch an increaſe?* The Lord replied, *They who arrive to that ſtate* (or come to that kingdom) *ſhall ſee.*

Theſe two paſſages ſeem indeed probably enough to have been in ſome antient Apocryphal Goſpel, were it not that Irenæus intimates they were received by tradition; and Papias dealt much in ſuch ſtories, as Euſebius informs us[a]. I ſuppoſe I need be at no pains to prove that theſe were not the words of Chriſt; and I cannot but wonder Dr. Grabe ſhould make any difficulty of diſbelieving the tradition[b]. I will only make two or three brief remarks on this head.

Firſt, *That the doctrine of the Millennium, or Chriſt's perſonal reign on earth, ſeems to owe its original to Papias.* So Euſebius expreſsly ſays[c]; and perhaps on this account we meet with the title of *Papianiſtæ* among the hereticks in Juſtinian's Code, lib. i. tit. v. leg. 5.

Secondly, *The generality of the antient Chriſtians fell into this opinion.* So Euſebius expreſsly ſaith[d].

Thirdly, *Papias ſeems to have borrowed it from the Jews*; for it is well known, and even from the Goſpels, that they had the expectations of a temporal kingdom from the Meſſias; and their oldeſt writings aſſure us, they expected ſuch things in it, as Papias and his followers did. See Galatin. Arcan. Cathol. Verit. l. 10. c. 4.

Fourthly, It ſeems very probable, that as Papias was the author of this doctrine, ſo *of this paſſage aſcribed to Chriſt*, and calculated to ſupport it[e].

[a] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.
[b] Spicileg. Patr. t. 2. p. 231.
[c] Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.
[d] Ibid.
[e] See Dr. Whitby's Treatiſe of the Millennium.

XII. *A* Saying

XII. *A* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt by Juſtin Martyr.* Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 267.

Διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν, Ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.

Wherefore our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath ſaid: *In whatſoever* [actions] *I ſhall find you, by them alſo I will judge you.*

This is a very noted paſſage, and has been not only cited in ſeveral of the antient books, but taken notice of by ſeveral of the moderns, inſomuch that for this reaſon Juſtin is reputed to have made uſe of the Apocryphal books. *Every body knows* (ſays Caſaubon[a]) *that Juſtin Martyr and the other Fathers have frequently appealed to Apocryphal books*; but I know not one inſtance which has been aſſigned for the proof of this, beſides the paſſage which we are now upon. It requires therefore conſideration, and the more, becauſe Juſtin, being one of the firſt Chriſtian writers whoſe works are extant, his rejecting all other books beſides thoſe now received, is a mighty confirmation of our preſent Canon. But I come to the paſſage, and to enquire what has been ſaid of it.

1. Langus (Juſtin's Latin tranſlator) propoſes two conjectures concerning this paſſage, viz. either *that it is a citation of ſome words of Chriſt which are in John* v. *Luke* xii. and xix. and more regard had to the ſenſe and meaning of thoſe places, than the words; or elſe *that it was taken out of ſome Apocryphal book*[b].

The laſt of theſe conjectures I ſhall preſently examine largely; as to the firſt, viz. that the *paſſage is an alluſion to ſome words of Chriſt*; I obſerve, that though perhaps it may not exactly be the caſe, yet it is not very abſurd; indeed I know not certainly what places in the Evangeliſts Langus refers to, becauſe he only cites the chapters at large, and not the verſes; but I ſuppoſe he meant thoſe, John v. 27—30.

[a] Exercit. adv. Baron. Annal. p. 54.

[b] Vid. Sylburg. Annot. in Loc. Juſtin.

and

and thoſe in Luke xix. 11—27. in which places there is a plain declaration that Chriſt, who is conſtituted judge, would be no reſpecter of perſons, but deal to every man according to his works. And this is the undoubted meaning of the Saying in Juſtin. I ſay therefore, this conjecture is not very abſurd, becauſe the Fathers uſually cite thus compendiouſly. But there ſeems to be this againſt it, that the paſſage is in the ſame words in many of the Fathers; and it is hardly probable that they ſhould paraphraſe the ſame way.

2. Dr. Cave [a] ſuppoſes it *taken out of the Apocryphal Goſpel of the Nazarenes.*

3. Dr. Grabe is of *the ſame opinion* [b].

4. Dr. Fell in his notes on the ſame ſaying of Chriſt, which is in §. 40. of the little book of Clemens Alexandrinus, entitled, *Quis Dives ſalvetur*, ſays, *Clemens took it out of ſome Apocryphal Goſpel.*

But againſt this opinion I argue,

I. That *Juſtin does not in any other part of his writings cite or take any thing out of any Apocryphal book; and therefore it is ſurpriſing he ſhould do it here.* He cites our preſent Canon, and particularly our four Goſpels, continually; I dare ſay, above 200 times; and is it likely he ſhould appeal to an Apocryphal Goſpel in this one place, and eſpecially when he might have found that which was equally to his purpoſe in ours? I leave the reader, who is unprejudiced, to judge.

II. It is probable *Juſtin Martyr took this paſſage out of the Prophecy of Ezechiel, and that he did not himſelf prefix to it the words,* Ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν, i. e. *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt ſaid,* but only Κύριος εἶπεν, *The Lord hath ſaid,* and that ſome ſcribe ignorantly imagining theſe to be the words of Chriſt, inſerted in his copy the words ἡμέτερος and Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

Firſt, For the proof of this *I appeal to the context, or ſeries of Juſtin's diſcourſe.* In which a queſtion is debated between Juſtin and Trypho, whether the Ebionites, or ſuch who profeſſed faith in Chriſt, and obedience to the Ceremonial Law, could be ſaved. Juſtin declares he thought they might, if

[a] Hiſt. Liter. in Matth. p. 8. [b] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 327.

they

they did not endeavour to pervert the Gentiles to their opinion, but that thoſe of the Jews who denied Chriſt, though they lived according to the Moſaick law, could not be ſaved without repentance in this life; for, ſays he, the goodneſs of God is ſuch, that he will accept thoſe who are truly penitent, as he declares by Ezechiel, but reject thoſe who perſiſt in their wickedneſs. Then follows the paſſage we are about, *Wherefore the Lord ſaith*; which alſo follows in Ezechiel in that place which Juſtin refers to; ſee Ezech. xviii. 26—30. And indeed it is remarkable, that this 30th verſe is now in the Septuagint Verſion more like the words of this paſſage than any of the preceding are to what Juſtin cites, as will appear by comparing them (Ἕκαστον κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ κρινῶ ὑμᾶς, λέγει Κύριος). Nor would it be at all ſtrange, if there were a much greater difference, conſidering how unlike the preſent copies of the Greek Verſion are to thoſe in Juſtin's time, and particularly to Juſtin's own copy of that tranſlation; which every one who has read Juſtin cannot but obſerve with ſurpriſe; and thoſe who have not may ſee in Vaillant's Diſſertation concerning the places in the New Teſtament cited out of the Old, and Archbiſhop Uſher's Syntagm. de Septuagint. Interp. c. 4. p. 42, &c. But,

Secondly, That which ſeems to put the matter paſt all doubt is, that Clemens Alexandrinus[a] citing the ſame paſſage, *expreſsly cites it as the words of God the Father, and not of Chriſt*, having juſt before alſo quoted the preceding verſes in Ezechiel. This Dr. Grabe has alſo obſerved, which makes it ſomewhat unaccountable that he ſhould in the very ſame paragraph ſuppoſe it taken out of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes.

Thirdly, Conſidering the ſeries of Juſtin's diſcourſe, *it would have been very abſurd for him to have cited a ſaying of Chriſt to ſtop the mouth of Trypho, who was a Jew*, and therefore would yield no regard to it, eſpecially when he had ſeveral paſſages in the books of the Old Teſtament, which his adverſary owned, to have produced, which were as much to

[a] In Lib. Quis Dives ſalvetur, §. 40.

his

his purpoſe, and really more particularly expreſſed his mind, than any words in the New.

XIII. *A* Hiſtory *of Chriſt's Baptiſm, related by Juſtin Martyr.* Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 315.

Καὶ τότε ελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν, ἔνθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτιζε, καταελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ. Καὶ ἀναβάντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν, ἔγραψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν.

And when Jeſus came to the river Jordan, where John was baptiſing, as Jeſus was deſcending into the water, *a fire was kindled in Jordan.* And when he came out of the water, the Apoſtles of this our Chriſt have wrote, *that the Holy Ghoſt did alight upon him as* (or in the form of) *a dove.*

That which is peculiar in this relation, and not in our Goſpels, is, *that a fire is ſaid to be kindled in Jordan, when Chriſt was going down into the river to be baptiſed*; and ſomething of the ſame nature we find there was in the Goſpel of the Ebionites, or Nazarenes, viz. that at Chriſt's baptiſm after the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, and the voice from heaven, *a great light ſhone around the place.* (See the paſſage at large out of Epiphanius, in the foregoing Part, Chap. XXV. Numb. 11.) On this account ſome learned men have imagined this hiſtory to have been taken by Juſtin Martyr out of this Apocryphal Goſpel. Thus thought a certain learned friend of Mr. Dodwell[a], and Dr. Mill[b]; but herein they are moſt evidently miſtaken, becauſe Juſtin's account, and that in the Ebionite Goſpel do ſo very much diſagree in circumſtances. Juſtin relates, *that as Chriſt was deſcending into the river, the fire was kindled,* and then after that *was the deſcent of the Holy*

[a] Differt. in Iren. ii. § 9.
[b] Annot. in Matt. iii. 16. & Prolegom. §. 269, & 766.

Ghoſt,

Ghoſt, and the voice from heaven: on the contrary, this Goſpel ſaith, that *the light was not* till after *Chriſt had aſcended out of the water, and the Spirit had deſcended, and the voice came down from heaven.* Beſides, if we look carefully into the paſſages, we ſhall eaſily perceive they are different, not only becauſe of the diſagreement, as has been ſaid, in point of time, which there is between them, but becauſe the ſubjects are quite different. The one ſpeaks *of a fire kindled in the river*; the other *of a great light encircling or ſhining around all the place*; which are two things ſo different, that I ſuppoſe, if this had been obſerved, no one would have imagined that Juſtin took his account out of the Ebionite Goſpel. But farther, he who will be at the pains to conſider *what opinion Juſtin had of the Ebionites, and their ſcheme* [a], will hardly perſuade himſelf that Father made uſe of their idle and ſilly Apocryphal books. Nor is there any thing that I have ſeen to be urged on the other ſide, beſides what Dr. Mill gathers from the words ἔγραψαν ἀπόστολοι, i. e. *the Apoſtles* (ſpeaking of ſeveral of them) *wrote this*, that Juſtin referred to *the Goſpel of the twelve Apoſtles*, which was the ſame with that of the Ebionites, or Nazarenes. But it is eaſy to anſwer, that theſe words, *the Apoſtles wrote*, reſpect only the latter part of the ſenſe, viz. the Holy Ghoſt's alighting upon Chriſt in the form of a dove, and not the former, becauſe the verb ἐπιπτῆναι is in *the infinitive mood*, but the other verbs are in the third perſon; and for this reaſon Dr. Grabe [b], from whom Dr. Mill borrowed this argument, rejects it, as not ſufficient to prove the point. That therefore which ſeems moſt probable upon the whole is, that this circumſtance at our Saviour's baptiſm was related by Juſtin only as what he had received by tradition; and if I miſtake not, this *was founded upon that paſſage in three of our Evangeliſts*, viz. that the *heavens were opened*; by which I know not what elſe can be underſtood beſides ſome lucid phænomenon in the air. "Il ſemble que les

[a] Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 265, &c.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 19, 20.

"nuages

" nuages s'écarterent tout d'un coup, et qu'une flamme de-
" ſcendit de l'entre-deux. Au moins les hommes ne peu-
" vent pas voir une autre ouverture du ciel, et l'on diſoit
" communément, que *le ciel s'ouvroit*, lors que cela arri-
" voit[a]:" *It is probable that the clouds divided ſuddenly, and that a flame of fire deſcended from between them. Otherwiſe men could not poſſibly ſee any opening of the heaven; beſides, we commonly ſay, the heavens are opened, when there is ſuch a phænomenon in them.* Hence it might eaſily paſs into a common opinion, that there was a fire at our Saviour's baptiſm; which, with the addition of one circumſtance, is the ſame as Juſtin ſays.

It is neceſſary here to add, that this ſame hiſtory was alſo in the Apocryphal book, entitled, *The Preaching of Paul and Peter*, in the paſſage above produced, Chap. XXX. Numb. 7. and ſeems to be referred to in the Latin poem of Juvencus upon the Goſpels thus;

Hæc memorans vitreas penetrabat fluminis undas,
Surgenti manifeſta Dei præſentia claret.

And Dr. Mill informs us alſo, that it is to be found in a very antient Manuſcript at Paris.

XIV. *A* Hiſtory *of Chriſt, in his younger years in Juſtin Martyr. Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud.* p. 316.

Καὶ ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, καὶ νομιζομένου Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱὸς ὑπάρχειν, καὶ ἀειδὴς, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ ἐκήρυσσον, φαινομένου, καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου· ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὤν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγὰ, διὰ τούτων καὶ

And when Jeſus came to Jordan, and was reputed the ſon of Joſeph the carpenter, and making a mean figure (either in reſpect of his perſon or garb) as the Scriptures have foretold, (ſee Iſa. liii. 1.) and himſelf was eſteemed a carpenter, *for he worked, when he was here on earth, at the*

[a] Cleric. Annot. in Mat. iii. 16.

carpenter's

τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων, καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον. *carbenter's trade, making ploughs and yokes (for oxen, &c.)*; thus making a pattern of righteouſneſs, and a laborious life.

There is at this day *extant a Goſpel of the Infancy of our Saviour* (of which more hereafter), in which we read of the actions and miracles of Chriſt, during the interval of his minority, and particularly of his working with his father in the carpenter's trade. Accordingly, Chap. XXXVIII. we read, that *Joſeph took him along with him to all the places where he was ſent for to do buſineſs, to make gates and milk-pails, and ſieves, and trunks, and that when Joſeph intended to make any thing longer or ſhorter, wider or narrower, as ſoon as Chriſt put his hand to the work, it was inſtantly done, according to Joſeph's intention, ſo that he had indeed but little occaſion to work, not being very dexterous at his trade.* It may perhaps be thought, Juſtin took what he ſays out of ſome ſuch Apocryphal books; but inaſmuch as this book was a forgery long after Juſtin's time, and it does not appear, there was any ſuch book in his time, it is much more probable, either that he relates only what he had received by tradition, or elſe that what he here ſaith, was his gloſs upon thoſe words of Mark, c. vi. 3. in which Chriſt is called by his own townſmen ὁ τέκτων, *the carpenter*. Origen indeed aſſerts[a], *that it is no where to be read in the Goſpels received by the Churches, that Chriſt was a carpenter*; which he never would ſo poſitively have aſſerted againſt Celſus, bantering our Saviour becauſe he was a carpenter by trade, unleſs he was well aſſured of the fact. It is probable therefore Chriſt was not called τέκτων, *the carpenter*, in any copies of St. Mark which Origen had ſeen; and accordingly, I obſerve, firſt, That in the parallel place in St. Matthew, c. xiii. 55. he is not called τέκτων, but τέκτονος υἱὸς, not *the carpenter*, but *the carpenter's ſon*. Secondly, That

[a] Οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελίων τέκτων αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναγέγραπται. Contr. Celſ. l. vi. p. 299.

many

many antient Manuſcripts, in this place of Mark, inſtead of τέκτων, read ὁ τῦ τέκτονος υἱὸς, viz. *the carpenter's ſon.* It is not to my preſent purpoſe to make any enquiries into the life of Chriſt, before his publick miniſtry; *it is generally thought*, as Juſtin ſays, *that he followed his father's trade* of carpentry. So Eraſmus [a], Eſtius [b], Chemnitius [c], Grotius [d], Lightfoot [e], Dr. Cave [f], and many others.

Thus much concerning Juſtin Martyr, till whoſe time there is the greateſt reaſon to conclude the ſacred text of the New Teſtament continued very pure and incorrupt; ſoon after the Hereticks of thoſe times made many and large interpolations and additions to it; ſuch as Marcion, Valentinus, and others, whereby they frequently make both Chriſt and his Apoſtles to ſpeak what they judged moſt agreeable to their own ſentiments. It would be endleſs to collect all theſe, nor would it be of any ſervice in ſettling the Canon, and indeed but little in ſettling the true reading of the text; Irenæus and Tertullian have mentioned ſeveral of them; Epiphanius has made a large collection of Marcion's alterations in the Goſpel of Luke, and St. Paul's Epiſtles. I ſhall think it ſufficient to produce the following remarkable inſtance of an addition to the Goſpel hiſtory made by the Gnoſticks in the ſecond century, and perhaps afterwards inſerted in ſome Apocryphal Goſpel. The inſtance I mean is that out of Irenæus adv. Hæreſ. lib. 1. c. 17. Speaking of the Gnoſticks, and their ſpurious Scriptures, he adds,

Προσπαραλαμβάνουσι δὲ εἰς τοῦτο κἀκεῖνο τὸ ῥᾳδιούργημα, ὡς τοῦ Κυρίου τὰ διὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου

They have alſo forged this falſe ſtory, that our Lord (when he was a child, and learning his Alphabet [g]) of

[a] Annot. in Matt. xiii. 55. et Mar. vi. 3.
[b] In Difficil. Loc. Script. ad Mar. vi. 3.
[c] Harmon. Evangel. vol. 3. p. 587.
[d] Annot. in Matt. xiii. 55.
[e] Harmon. of the New Teſt. §. 8. in fine.
[f] Hiſtor. Literar. in Chriſt.
[g] This parentheſis I have added out of the old Latin tranſlation; the Greek is preſerved in Epiphanius, Hæreſ. 34. §. 18.

his

δασκάλε αὐτῷ φήσαντος, καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν, εἰπὲ ἄλφα, ἀποκρίνασθαι τὸ ἄλφα· πάλιν τε τὸ βῆτα διδασκάλε κελεύσαντος εἰπεῖν, ἀποκρίνασθαι τὸν Κύριον· Σύ μοι πρότερον εἰπὲ τί ἐστι τὸ ἄλφα, καὶ τότε σοὶ ἐρῶ τί ἐστι τὸ βῆτα. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐξηγοῦνται ὡς αὐτοῦ μόνε τὸ ἄγνωστον ἐπισταμένε, ὃ ἐφανέρωσεν ἐν τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ ἄλφα.

his schoolmaster, when he said to him, as is usual, *say* A; Christ answered A; again, when the master bid him say B, the Lord said to him, *Do you first tell me what* A *is, and then I will tell you what* B *is.* And this they so expound, as if he alone understood the mystery revealed in the letter A.

This passage is in *the Gospel of the Infancy*, published by Cotelerius in Greek, c. vi. and in that translated out of Arabick into Latin by Mr. Sike, c. xlviii. though with some variations and additions in both, especially the last; where it is said, *that upon Christ's refusing to say the letter* B, *his master threatening him with the rod, he run through all the Alphabet, told his master the meaning of the letters, &c. which he admired, and said he believed he was born before Noah.*

XV. *A* Saying *of Christ, in Irenæus adv. Hæres. lib.* I. *c.* 17.

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰρηκέναι, πολλάκις ἐπεθύμησα ἀκοῦσαι ἕνα τῶν λόγων τούτων, καὶ οὐκ ἔσχον τὸν ἐροῦντα, ἐμφαίνοντός φασιν εἶναι διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς τὸν ἀληθῶς ἕνα Θεὸν, ὃν οὐκ ἐγνώκεισαν.

But that which *(Christ)* has said, *I have often desired to hear one of those sayings, but have found no one who could tell me*, they (viz. *the Gnosticks)* interpret concerning him who is the only true God, whom they have not known.

Dr. Mill[a] thinks this passage to have been in one of the Gospels of the Valentinians, or Gnosticks; but I fear he is herein much mistaken; for though Irenæus had mentioned

[a] Prolegom. §. 331.

their Apocryphal books in the beginning of the Chapter, yet he had left that ſubject, and was giving inſtances of their *abſurd interpretations of the true Goſpels*; and this he aſſigns as one; ſo that I am apt to think theſe words were in Irenæus's copy of one of the four Goſpels, becauſe it is certain he acknowledged no other [a].

XVI. *A* Hiſtory *of the age of Chriſt, in Irenæus adv. Hæreſ.* lib. 2. cap. 39.

Quia autem triginta annorum ætas primæ indolis eſt juvenis, et extenditur uſque ad quadrageſimum annum, omnis quilibet confitebitur; a quadrageſimo autem et quinquageſimo anno declinat *jam in ætatem ſeniorem; quam habens Dominus noſter docebat, ſicut Evangelium et omnes ſeniores teſtantur, qui in Aſia apud Joannem diſcipulum Domini convenerunt, id ipſum tradidiſſe iis Joannem.* Permanſit autem cum eis uſque ad Trajani tempora. Quidam autem eorum non ſolum Joannem, ſed et alios Apoſtolos viderunt, et hæc eadem ab ipſis audierunt, et teſtantur de hujuſmodi relatione.

Foraſmuch as a young man firſt arrives to a perfect maturity at his thirtieth year, and continues therein till the fortieth, as every one muſt acknowledge, and that from his fortieth or fiftieth year he begins to decline towards old age, *to which age our Lord having arrived did teach, as the Goſpel and all the elders do teſtify, who attended upon John, the Diſciple of our Lord, in* Aſia; (affirming) that John himſelf gave them this account. Now he continued with them till the time of Trajan, and ſome of them did not only ſee John, but alſo other Apoſtles, and received the ſame account from them, and they affirm this ſame tradition to be true.

This is indeed ſomewhat ſurpriſing, viz. that Irenæus ſhould ſo expreſsly aſſert, that *Chriſt lived and taught beyond his fortieth, if not till his fiftieth year*; whereas it is a thing

[a] Adverſ. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 11.

moſt

moſt notorious, that Chriſt was crucified between his thirty third and thirty fourth year. His arguments to prove it are as extraordinary as his aſſertion, viz. *That ſince he came into the world to ſave perſons of all ages*, viz. *infants, little ones, boys, young men, and old men, it was neceſſary he ſhould paſs through all theſe degrees of age.* But if this will prove any thing, it muſt prove Chriſt to have lived much longer than Irenæus contends for, and not only to the age of fifty, but even to the age of the antediluvian Patriarchs; and even, for the ſame reaſon, to the age of Methuſalem himſelf. It is ſtrange indeed he ſhould ſo poſitively urge the teſtimony of St. John for this notorious falſehood, and ſay that he delivered it to the Preſbyters of Aſia; for this cannot be ſuppoſed true, without ſuppoſing alſo at the ſame time, that our accounts in all the Goſpels are falſe. Indeed, the next argument, which he uſes in the beginning of the next Chapter, is ſomewhat more plauſible, viz. from thoſe words of the Jews to our Saviour, John viii. 57. *Thou art not yet fifty years old, and haſt thou ſeen Abraham?* Whence, ſays he, it appears, *that he was near fifty, they gathering this either from the rolls of the tax* (in which every one's name and age were written), *or from his countenance.* But neither is this argument of any force, becauſe if we ſuppoſe Chriſt to have been, as he really was, no more than thirty three, the Jews might very well be ſuppoſed to aſk their queſtion thus, viz. either,

1. Becauſe our Saviour, being a man of ſorrows, and acquainted with grief, and having gone through infinite fatigues and labours [a], *might very probably be thought eight or ten years older than he really was*; which is all that need be ſuppoſed to make the Jews' queſtion juſt and pertinent, and is a very common thing: or, which ſeems to me to have been the caſe:

2. Nothing is more common in ſuch caſes, *than for perſons to expreſs themſelves by a round number*, not confining themſelves when the ſubject is ſuch as does not reſtrain them to any exact particular number [b].

[a] Iſai. liii. 3.

[b] Vid. Grot. ad loc.

Irenæus therefore is certainly miſtaken in this matter, although he plead Apoſtolical tradition for the ſupport of his notion; and it ſeems plain that he was drawn into the miſtake by a too warm oppoſition to the Gnoſticks, who aſſerted, that *Chriſt did not live to the end of his thirtieth year, but was crucified in the twelfth month of his miniſtry* [a]. And here by the way I cannot but obſerve, that ſeveral of the moſt celebrated Fathers have coincided with the Gnoſticks in this opinion, and aſſerted that *Chriſt preached but one year, and ſuffered in the end of his thirtieth.* Thus Tertullian [b], Clemens Alexandrinus [c], Lactantius [d], in the places cited in the margin.

But to return to Irenæus, however abſurd the preceding hiſtory is, it cannot be ſuppoſed with any reaſon, that it was in any of the Apocryphal Goſpels, unleſs we were to ſuppoſe with the great annaliſt Cardinal Baronius [e], that this *paſſage was foiſted into the works of Irenæus*; but for this there is not the leaſt evidence, as the learned Jeſuit Petavius has well demonſtrated in his notes on Epiphanius [f].

XVII. *A* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt in Athenagoras, Legat. pro Chriſtianis*, c. 28.

Πάλιν ἡμῖν λέγοντος τοῦ Λόγου, Ἐάν τις διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ δευτέρου καταφιλήσῃ, ὅτι ἤρεσεν αὐτῷ.

Again, the Word ſaith unto us, *If any one ſhall kiſs a woman a ſecond time, becauſe it pleaſes him*, &c

It is not very eaſy to determine any thing certain concerning this paſſage. Pfaffius [g] ſuppoſes it to have been in ſome Apocryphal Goſpel, and an addition to thoſe words of Chriſt, Matt. v. 28. and ſo makes the following words to be a continuation of it, viz.

[a] See lib. 1. cap. 1. and lib. 2. cap. 36—38. of Irenæus.
[b] Adv. Judæos, c. 8.
[c] Strom. l. 1. p. 340.
[d] Lib. 4. c. 10.
[e] Annal. t. 1. An. 34. n. 137. apud Daillé, of the right uſe of the Fathers, b. 2. c. 4.
[f] Hæreſ. 51. Alog. in Diatrib. 2. de anno et die Dom. Paſſ. p. 145, 146.
[g] Apud Fabrit. Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſt. P. 3. p. 522.

And

Καὶ ἐπιφέροντος, ἔτως ἓν ἀκριβώσασθαι τὸ φίλημα, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ προσκύνημα δεῖ, ὡς εἴ πᾳ μικρὸν τῇ διανοίᾳ παραθολωθείη, ἔξω ἡμᾶς τῆς αἰωνίᾳ τιθέντος ζωῆς.

And intimates, that *we ought to be ſo diſcreet in kiſſing, that it may rather be a civil ſalutation, becauſe if we defile our minds with an unchaſte thought, we ſhall not attain eternal life.*

It is evident theſe laſt words cannot be the words of our Saviour, becauſe they are delivered in the plural number, we ſhall not *attain eternal life*, which is unlike enough to any thing that ever Chriſt ſaid. Beſides, if the words be cloſely conſidered, it will appear that the latter part is an explication of, or inference from, the former, the one being delivered in the third perſon, the other in the firſt; if therefore either part be to be eſteemed as the words of Chriſt, it can only be the former; although indeed it may be juſtly queſtioned, whether Athenagoras intended any ſuch citation, becauſe when he cites any thing of Chriſt, he prefixes φησὶ to it, i. e. (The Lord) *ſaith*, as he does twice in this ſame paragraph. Conradus Geſnerus, the tranſlator of Athenagoras, ſeems to have thought the ſame when he tranſlates the words, Πάλιν ἡμῖν λέγοντος τὸ λόγῳ, &c. *Rurſus quum religio noſtra nos doceat*, adding *Sicut vir quidam ſanctus ſcripſit, ſi quis, &c. Again our religion teacheth us, as a certain holy man hath wrote, that if any one, &c.* But perhaps Athenagoras might have ſome ſuch words in his copy of St. Matthew, which were at firſt indeed a marginal gloſs upon theſe words, ch. v. 28. *If any man looketh upon a woman ſo as to luſt after her, &c.* but afterwards, as was very uſual, crept into the text: and this may ſeem the more probable, he having juſt before cited theſe words of Matthew.

XVIII. *A* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt in Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom.* l. i. p. 346.

Αἰτεῖσθε γὰρ, φησὶ, τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται.

Seek thoſe things which are great, and thoſe things which are ſmall ſhall be added to you.

Dr. Grabe[a] and Dr. Mill[b] imagined this *paſſage to be taken out of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes*; which indeed, if it ſhould be true, would be no credit to this Goſpel, becauſe (as I have above proved, Chap. XXVIII.) Clemens abſolutely rejects the authority of all Goſpels, beſides thoſe four now received; but the truth is, he could not take it thence, becauſe he did not underſtand the Hebrew language, in which that Goſpel was written, and (as I have[c] ſhewn) *no tranſlation of it was made till Jerome made his.* Mr. Fabritius[d] conjectures more probably, that theſe were the words of ſome copies at that time interpolated into Matt. vi. 33. *Seek firſt the kingdom of God and his righteouſneſs, and all other things ſhall be added unto you:* but neither is this ſo, becauſe the ſame Clemens in another place[e] cites theſe words of Matthew, as they are in our preſent copies, and not as they are here. Nothing therefore is more evident than that Clemens, in the paſſage under conſideration, reſpected the ſenſe of Chriſt's words, without preciſely tranſcribing them, i. e. rather choſe to expound the words, than literally to cite them; and this is moſt undeniably proved by another place which I find in the ſame Clemens[f], where he both produces the text, and theſe words as an expoſition, Ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην· ταῦτα γὰρ μεγάλα· τὰ δὲ μικρὰ καὶ περὶ τὸν βίον, ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν· i. e. Seek firſt the kingdom of heaven, and (its) righteouſneſs, *Theſe are the great things*, and theſe things ſhall be added unto you, *Theſe are the ſmall things*, and ſuch as concern this life. Hence alſo Origen, who was one of the ſcholars of Clemens, does more than once in his works paraphraſe theſe words of Chriſt in the ſame manner[g].

XIX. *A* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt, and cited by moſt of the antient Fathers.*

Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται.	Be ye ſkilful money-changers.

[a] Spicileg. Patr. t. 1. p. 14.
[b] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 648. & §. 695. & in Matt. vi. 33.
[c] Chap. XXVII.
[d] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſtam. Par. 1. p. 329.
[e] Pædagog. lib. 2. p. 198.
[f] Strom. l. iv. p. 488.
[g] Vid. contr. Celſ. lib. 7. p. 362. & de Orat. §. 2.

It

It is ſurpriſing to obſerve how many of the primitive writers of Chriſtianity have cited this paſſage in their works; Clemens Alexandrinus [a], Apelles [b], Origen [c], Dionyſius Alexandrinus [d], Cyril of Jeruſalem [e], Pamphilus [f], Athanaſius [g], Jerome [h], Cyril of Alexandria [i], beſides ſeveral more, have cited it; Cotelerius, Uſher, Valeſius, Dr. Grabe, Mr. Fabritius, Mr. Whiſton, Dr. Mill, and others among the moderns, have obſerved it; though I know not any ſufficient remarks that have been yet made concerning its true original; for which reaſon I deſign more particularly to diſcuſs it. *It is ſuppoſed by moſt to have been taken out of the Hebrew Goſpel of the Nazarenes*; ſo Cotelerius [k], Uſher [l], Valeſius [m]: but this muſt needs be a miſtake, becauſe very few of the Fathers underſtood the language of that Goſpel, and a verſion was not made of it till Jerome had made his, as is above proved, Chap. XXVII. That which appears to me moſt probable upon examining the places of the Fathers, where this paſſage is cited, I ſhall reduce into the following diſtinct obſervations. viz.

1. None of all the writers, who have mentioned it, *do cite it as the ſaying or words of Chriſt within the firſt four centuries*, except Origen, Jerome, and the Heretick Apelles.

2. *The meaning of the paſſage*, Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται, Be ſkilful money-changers, is *the very ſame with that exhortation of the Apoſtle*, 1 Theſſ. v. 21. *Prove all things*, viz. that as money changers they ſhould be careful to diſtinguiſh between that which is good and bad, and like them try and prove all. This is evident from the deſign of every citation, but more clearly from the explications which the Fathers themſelves

[a] Strom. lib. 1. p. 354.
[b] Apud Epiphan. Hæreſ. 44. §. 2.
[c] Tom. 19. in Joann. viii. 20.
[d] Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. c. 7.
[e] Catech. vi. in fine.
[f] Apolog. pro Orig. in initio.
[g] Epiſt. ad Solitar.
[h] Epiſt. ad Miner. et Alex. in fine.
[i] Apud Coteler. Not. in Conſtit. Apoſtol. l. 2. c. 36.
[k] Loc. cit.
[l] Prolegom. in Epiſt. Ignat. c. 8.
[m] In Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. c. 7.

have given of theſe words. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus *compares a perſon ignorant in logick, and not knowing how to diſtinguiſh between things, to an ignorant money-changer, who cannot diſtinguiſh good money from bad*[a], and elſewhere[b] expreſsly calls them the δοκίμους τραπεζίτας, i. e. the *ſkilful money-changers*, τὸ κίβδηλον νόμισμα τῆ Κυρίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆ παραχαράγματος διακρίνοντας, *who can diſtinguiſh the bad money* (pretending to be the Lord's) *by its ſtamp and character*, i. e. *hereſy from truth*; and Jerome, after having cited the paſſage, *Be ſkilful money-changers*, adds for illuſtration[c], *like thoſe who reject that for counterfeit coin, which has not the image of Cæſar ſo ſtamped upon it as it ought to have.* Once more, in the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*[d], after the paſſage produced, in the next paragraph we read, *Be as ſkilful dealers in money, who reject that which is bad, and keep that which is good.* It is plain therefore, to mention no more inſtances, the ſcope of the exhortation is, that we be careful in proving, trying, or examining things (as the money-changers do their money), and this is the very ſame as St. Paul ſays, *Prove all things.* Which being ſo, I obſerve,

3. *The Fathers cite this paſſage as the ſaying of the Apoſtle, and do all of them* (except Origen and Jerome) *cite it inſtead of this very paſſage of St. Paul*, (1 Theſſ. v. 21.) *Prove all things.* This is as evident as any thing can be, by a view of the places: Dionyſius Alexandrinus calls it ἀποστολικὴ φωνὴ, i. e. *the Apoſtle's ſaying*[e]. Cyril of Alexandria in ſeveral places calls it *the words of Paul*[f]. Cyril of Jeruſalem[g], Pamphilus, and others, add the following words of Paul in the end of this verſe and ver. 22. *Hold faſt that which is good, and abſtain from the appearance of evil.*

4. It is evident therefore, *this was not any ſaying of Chriſt, but of Paul*; and ſo not taken out of any Apocryphal Goſpel.

[a] Strom. l. 6. p. 655.
[b] Strom. l. 7. p. 754.
[c] Epiſt. ad Miner. et Alex. in fine.
[d] Lib. 2. c. 36, 37.
[e] Apud Euſeb. l. 7. c. 7.
[f] Apud Coteler. loc. cit.
[g] Catech. vi. in fine.
[h] Apolog. pro Origene in init.

There

There are indeed two difficulties attending this hypotheſis, viz. *How ſo many Fathers could agree to cite St. Paul's words thus different from what they are in our preſent copies*, and how *Origen*, *Jerome*, and *Apelles*, were *ſo miſtaken in citing it as a ſaying of Chriſt.*

As to the firſt, I frankly own I believe it proceeded *from an early interpolation in the text*; ſome one, oppoſite to St. Paul's words, writing for explication ὡς δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται, in the margin, he who tranſcribed that copy inſerted it in the text with the addition of the verb γίνεσθε, which he apprehended needful to complete the ſenſe.

As to the latter; viz. Origen, Jerome, and Apelles citing it as a ſaying of Chriſt, I anſwer,

Firſt, That it is not ſtrange Jerome ſhould do ſo, when Origen had done it before him, becauſe he ſo much followed him, and depended upon him.

Secondly, Either Origen failed in memory, and wrote down that as a ſaying of Chriſt, which, if he had examined, he would have found to be St. Paul's; which is very common: or elſe,

Thirdly, Some ſcribe made the addition ἐντολὴν Κυρίε, *i. e. the command of God*, as an introduction to the paſſage, which they often did; and in doing ſo were often miſtaken.

Fourthly, Whereas the Heretick Apelles quotes the paſſage, as being ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ, *in the Goſpel*; we may ſuppoſe him *either miſtaken*, or elſe that *he uſes the word Goſpel in a large ſenſe*, to denote St. Paul's Epiſtle; and this cannot ſeem ſtrange to thoſe who conſider, that the word Goſpel is frequently uſed not only in the New Teſtament for the *Doctrine of the Goſpel*, but is alſo by the primitive writers frequently *put for any book of the New Teſtament.* Thus Clemens Romanus calls the Epiſtle of St. Paul to the Corinthians *the Goſpel of Paul*[a]: or perhaps, Apelles might read theſe words in the falſe Goſpel which he made uſe of, and which after-

[a] Epiſt. ad Corinth. I. c. 47. See above, Part II. Chap. III. and Junius and Cotelerius on that place of Clemens.

wards

wards went under his name (ſee Part I. Chap. VII. Numb. IV.); into which, being ſo noted a ſaying, it was inſerted out of this place of St. Paul's Epiſtle.

It cannot be improper here to obſerve, that Mr. Whiſton [a] urges this paſſage, becauſe it is cited by Dionyſius Alexandrinus as an ἀποστολικὴ φωνὴ, i. e. *an Apoſtolical ſaying* (and, as he thinks, out of the Conſtitutions); *as a ſtrong aud almoſt undeniable atteſtation to the Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles*, and imagines this *ſuch a citation as cannot fairly be ſet aſide by any.* But I ſuppoſe, even Mr. Whiſton himſelf will allow, that the foregoing remarks do ſufficiently overthrow his argument; and I muſt obſerve, that ἀποστολικὴ φωνὴ may as well be tranſlated *the words of the Apoſtle* in the ſingular number, as *the words of the Apoſtles* in the plural.

XX. *A* Saying *aſcribed to Chriſt in Clemens Alexandrinus*, Strom. lib. 5. p. 578.

Οὐ γὰρ φθονῶν, φησὶ, παρήγγειλεν ὁ Κύριος ἔν τινι Εὐαγγελίῳ· Μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς οἰκίας μου.

For the (Lord), ſays he, hath declared without envy in ſome Goſpel, *My ſecret is to me, and the children of my houſe.*

I do not know any one who has obſerved this paſſage beſides Mr. Fabritius, who places it among the fragments of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes [b], and in his note conjectures, that it was perhaps in *the Goſpel of the Egyptians*; but for want of a more cloſe examination, this learned writer is apparently miſtaken in both his conjectures, as will evidently appear by the following remark; viz. That

Clemens did not cite theſe words as the words of Chriſt, but as the words of the prophet Iſaiah; for

1. *They are now to be found in ſeveral copies of the Septuagint Verſion of* Iſai. xxiv. 16. with but little variation. In the

[a] Eſſay on the Conſtit. p. 165. [b] Cod. Apoc. Nov. Teſt. p. 361.

Scholia

Scholia of the Greek Verſion I find it aſſerted, " That *in* " *ſome copies are the following words,* τὸ μυστήριόν μου ἐμοὶ, τὸ μυστή- " ριόν μου ἐμοὶ. καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς. *They are alſo in Procopius, though* " *noted with an aſteriſk. Jerome ſays, they were not origi-* " *nally in the Septuagint, but interpolated out of Theodotion's* " *Greek tranſlation. Chryſoſtom and Theodoret alſo read it.*" (See the Cambridge Scholia on the Septuagint). Agreeable to this the old Latin Vulgate renders it *ſecretum meum mihi, ſecretum meum mihi*; and though our Engliſh tranſlators render it *my leanneſs, my leanneſs, woe unto me*, yet in the margin for leanneſs they have put *my ſecret to me*; nor indeed is there any better way of interpreting the Hebrew word רזי, which properly denotes *a ſecret*, and is thus underſtood by the Chaldee interpreter here, as it is commonly alſo uſed in that language; ſee Dan. ii. 18, 27, 28, &c. and hence the Angel Raziel is ſo called, *quia Deo a ſecretis eſt.*

2. It being plain that theſe words were in the Greek copies of Iſaiah, I add, that *Clemens cited them thence*: this is undeniable, unleſs we ſuppoſe him by miſtake to have taken theſe to be the words of Chriſt, which were the words of the prophet, and to have cited accordingly; but that he really was not miſtaken, is evident; for he had in the words next before cited the prophet *Iſaiah*, and then adds, ὁ γὰρ φθονῶν, φησὶ, *for without envy he ſaid*, i. e. the prophet ſaid; for that verb cannot poſſibly relate to any one elſe, no other noun having been before; and though the noun Κύριος immediately follow, yet it has its proper verb παρήγγειλεν, *the Lord hath declared*; but ſaying and *declaring* being the ſame thing, both the verbs cannot refer to that noun; and conſequently one or other of them muſt be ſuperfluous, and not wrote by the author at firſt: but this is the latter, becauſe we certainly know the prophet wrote thoſe words, but do not know that Chriſt did ſpeak them. It is therefore evident that Clemens did not write the words παρήγγειλεν ὁ Κύριος ἐν τινι Εὐαγγελίῳ, *the Lord hath declared in a certain Goſpel*, but they were inſerted by ſome ignorant tranſcriber, who imagined them to be the words of Chriſt, and by adding the word παρήγγειλεν, when the word φησὶν ſo immediately

ately preceded, he plainly betrayed his ignorance and interpolation. This is yet farther confirmed by Clement's citing, as he does in the next paragraph, the ſame prophet thus, πάλιν ὁ προφήτης, and *again the prophet ſaith*, which he could not have ſaid, had he not cited him before. All this is ſo evident, that I think it may be fairly urged as an inſtance to ſupport ſome conjectures which I have made above, concerning the interpolations of the ſcribes in antient manuſcripts.

XXI. *A* Hiſtory *of Chriſt, and his Parents, in* Orig. contr. Celſ. l. 1. p. 22.

Ὀνειδίζει δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐκ κώμης αὐτὸν γεγονέναι Ἰουδαϊκῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἐγχωρίας καὶ πενιχρᾶς, καὶ χειρωνήτιδος. Φησὶ δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ γήμαντος, τέκτονος τὴν τέχνην ὄντος, ἐξελεγχθεῖσαν ὡς μεμοιχευμένην. Εἶτα λέγει, ὡς ἐκβληθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, καὶ πλανωμένη ἀτίμως σκότιον ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ ὅτι ἔστος διὰ πενίαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον μισθαρνήσας, κἀκεῖ δυνάμεών τινων πειρασθεὶς, ἐφ' αἷς Αἰγύπτιοι σεμνύνονται, ἐπανῆλθεν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσι μέγα φρονῶν, καὶ δι' αὐτὰς Θεὸν αὐτὸν ἀνηγόρευσε.

He ridicules (viz. Celſus) our Saviour, that he was born in a mean village of Judæa, and of a mean poor woman, who got her bread by ſpinning, and was turned away by her huſband, who was a carpenter, becauſe ſhe was charged with adultery. Again, he adds, that when ſhe was turned out by her huſband, and ſcandalouſly wandered about the countries, ſhe privately brought forth Jeſus, and that he being through poverty obliged to work as a ſervant in Egypt, and there having learnt ſome ſort of powerful arts, which are much reputed in Egypt, he returned much lifted up with his arts, and thought becauſe of them he deſerved to be eſteemed as a God.

Whether

Whether Celſus met with this in any Apocryphal Goſpel, or no, I cannot tell; ſomething of this ſort we meet with in ſome Apocryphal books extant in St. Auſtin's time, under the name of Chriſt. Concerning the magical power by which he wrought his miracles, ſee above, Chap. XIV. If he took it out of ſome ſuch book, it can no way affect the credit of our Canon, that ſuch an enemy ſhould be fond of ſuch ridiculous writings. But I rather think it was a forgery among the Jews, than any part of an Apocryphal Goſpel.

XXII. *A* Hiſtory *of our Saviour's Relations, according to the Fleſh, in* Epiphanius, Hæreſ. 78. §. 7 et 8.

Πῶς γὰρ ἠδύνατο ὁ τοσοῦτος γέρων παρθένον ἔχειν γυναῖκα, ὢν ἀπὸ χήρας γυναικὸς χήρας τοσαῦτα ἔτη; ἑτὸς μὲν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ἀδελφὸς γίνεται τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ἦν δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰακὼβ, ἐπίκλην δὲ Πάνθηρ καλαμένα· ἀμφότεροι ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πάνθηρος ἐπίκλην γεννῶνται· ἔσχε δὲ ἑτὸς ὁ Ἰωσὴφ τὴν μὲν πρώτην αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ κυίσκει αὐτῷ αὕτη παῖδας τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἓξ, τέσσαρας μὲν ἄρρενας, θηλείας δὲ δύο, καθάπερ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον καὶ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐσαφήνισαν. Ἔσχε μὲν οὖν πρωτότοκον τὸν Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Ὠβλίαν, ἑρμηνευόμενον τεῖχος, καὶ δίκαιον ἐπικληθέντα, Ναζωραῖον· δὲ

How could a man ſo old have a young virgin for his wife, having been a widower ſo many years after his firſt wife's deceaſe? For Joſeph was the brother of Cleophas, the ſon of James, ſirnamed Panther. Both theſe were the ſons of him who was ſirnamed Panther. This Joſeph married his firſt wife out of the tribe of Judah, by whom he had ſix children; four of which were males, and two females, as appears by the Goſpel of Mark and John. His firſt-born was James, who was ſirnamed Oblias (which ſignifies a wall), and was called *the Juſt*, and he was a Nazarite,

which

ὄντα, ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται ἅγιος. ——— Τίκτει μὲν τοῦτον τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐγγύς πως περὶ ἔτη γεγονὼς τεσσαράκοντα πλείω ἐλάσσω. Μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ γίνεται παῖς Ἰωσῆ καλούμενος, εἶτα μετ' αὐτὸν Συμεών, ἔπειτα Ἰούδας· καὶ δύο θυγατέρες, ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἡ Σαλώμη καλουμένη· καὶ τέθνηκεν αὐτοῦ ἡ γυνή, καὶ μετὰ ἔτη πολλὰ λαμβάνει τὴν Μαρίαν χήρος, κατάγων ἡλικίαν περί που ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν καὶ πρόσω ὁ ἀνήρ. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα λαμβάνει τὴν Μαρίαν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ λέγει.

which denotes a *holy perſon*— He had his ſon James, when he was much about forty years of age. After him he had a ſon called Joſe, and then after him Simeon, afterwards Jude; and two daughters, one called Mary, another Salome: and his wife died, and after many years of widowhood he married Mary, when he was upwards of fourſcore years old. Then he took Mary, as the Goſpel relates.

I know not whence Epiphanius collected this ſo particular account of our Saviour's family; there was indeed an *Apocryphal and ſpurious piece under the name of* James, and another [a] intitled, *The Goſpel of Peter*; in one of which Origen ſays it was affirmed, *That Joſeph had children by a former wife, before he married Mary*; and Jerome alſo ſays, *this was in ſeveral of the Apocryphal Goſpels.* He adds, that the former wife's name was Eſcha [b]. But it does not at all appear, that Epiphanius made any uſe of ſuch books, who is ever moſt forward to declare againſt them; and as to this hiſtory it ſeems to be formed upon a very common tradition among the Fathers, that Joſeph had children by a former wife, which they very zealouſly contend for, in order to ſupport their prevailing opinion, which they were ſo fond of, viz. *the perpetual virginity of Mary.* And it is on this very ſcore Epiphanius mentions it here, againſt the Antidicomarianitæ, who denied it [c].

[a] See above, Part II. Chap. XX. Numb. xxiv.

[b] Comment. in Matth. xii. 49.

[c] See Biſhop Pearſon on the Creed, p. 175.

XXIII. *An*

XXIII. *An* Anſwer *of the Apoſtles to Chriſt, in Jerome.* Dialog. contr. Pelag. Hæreſ. lib. 2. c. 6.

CHRIST having reproved them for their unbelief of his reſurrection;

Illi ſatisfaciebant dicentes, *Seculum iſtud iniquitatis et incredulitatis ſubſtantia eſt, quæ non ſinit per immundos ſpiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem; idcirco jam nunc revela juſtitiam tuam.*

They were ſatisfied, and ſaid, "*This age is the ſubſtance of* "*iniquity and unbelief, which* "*through the* (influence of) "*evil ſpirits, will not ſuffer* "*the true power of God to be* "*perceived; therefore even* "*now manifeſt thy juſtice.*"

This paſſage Jerome, in the place cited, affirms was in ſome copies of St. Mark (eſpecially the Greek ones), in the end of the laſt chapter, viz. after ver. 14, and becomes conſiderable here, only becauſe it has been ſuppoſed by ſeveral learned men to be taken out of ſome Apocryphal Goſpels. So Eraſmus, and Father Simon [a], to whom Dr. Mill [b] ſubſcribes, and adds a very probable conjecture, that it was taken out of one of the Manichæan Goſpels, and perhaps that of Thomas; which, if indeed it be true, yet does no way affect the credit of our preſent Canon. For beſides that I have above proved the Goſpels of the Manichees to be Apocryphal; ſo this paſſage itſelf proves the book which contained it, out of which it was inſerted into Mark, to have been ſuch [c]. As to its being interpolated into the laſt chapter of Mark, I have here no concern, that matter belonging to the queſtion about the integrity of the text. I ſhall only add, that this chapter of that Goſpel has ſuffered many alterations; *for in many copies*

[a] Eraſm. in Mar. 16. et Sim. Critic. Hiſt. Nov. Teſt. Par. 1. c. 11.

[b] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſtam. §. 724. et in Loc.

[c] Vid. Eraſm. et Mill. Loc. cit.

the

the laſt twelve verſes are entirely omitted: Jerome ſays [a], they were to be found but in few copies; and almoſt all the Greek books had them not. I mention this, becauſe Dr. Mill [b] ſuppoſes the interpolated verſe, which I am now conſidering, did appear ſo plainly ſpurious, that ſome ignorant tranſcribers left out the reſt of the chapter upon the account of that.

XXIV. *A* Queſtion *of the Apoſtles, and* Reply *of our Saviour, preſerved in St. Auſtin,* contr. Adverſ. Leg. et Prophet. lib. 2. c. 4.

Sed Apoſtolis, inquit, Dominum noſtrum interrogantibus de Judæorum prophetis, quid ſentiri deberet, qui de adventu ejus aliquid ceciniſſe in præteritum putabantur? Commotus talia etiam eos nunc ſentire reſpondit, Dimiſiſtis vivum qui ante vos eſt, et de mortuis fabulamini. Quid mirum, quandoquidem hoc teſtimonium de Scripturis neſcio quibus Apocryphis protulit, ſi de prophetis Dei talia confinxerunt hæretici, qui eaſdem literas non accipiunt?

But, ſaith he (viz. the Manichee, againſt whom he writes), when the Apoſtles aſked our Lord, *What opinion ſhould be entertained of thoſe Jewiſh prophets, who were ſuppoſed formerly to have foretold things relating to his coming?* He being angry that they ſhould think any ſuch thing at that time, anſwered, *You diſregard him who is alive, and among you, and deal in idle ſtories about thoſe who are dead.* But it is no wonder, ſeeing he took this teſtimony out of ſome Apocryphal books, that the Hereticks, who do not receive the ſame (ſacred) books, ſhould forge ſuch things of the prophets.

Concerning this ſaying there need no more be ſaid, but that though it was part of an Apocryphal Goſpel, yet it was taken thence by a wretched Heretick, and with this deſign to prove his doctrine of the neceſſity of not regarding the antient Jew-

[a] Epiſt. ad Hedib. Quæſt. 3. [b] Annot. in Mar. xvi. 14.

iſh

iſh prophets. Dr. Mill [a] conjectures it was taken out of the Goſpel of Thomas, in which though he perhaps may be right, yet he is miſtaken in ſuppoſing it to have been ever interpolated into either of our preſent Goſpels.

XXV. *A* Saying *in ſome Goſpel, according to the Opinion of Jerome, in* Ezech. xvii.

Tale quid et illud Evangelii ſonat, Eſt confuſio quæ ducit ad mortem, et eſt confuſio quæ ducit ad vitam.	Something like that are the words of the Goſpel, *There is a ſhame which leadeth to death, and a ſhame which leadeth to life.*

Concerning theſe words, Mr. Fabritius [b] ſeems rightly to gueſs, that Jerome failed in point of memory, citing that out of the Goſpel which is not there; perhaps he meant thoſe words in the book of Eccleſiaſticus, c. iv. 21. which are not much unlike: *There is a ſhame that bringeth ſin, and there is a ſhame which is glory and grace.*

Theſe are all the *Sayings* and *Hiſtories* of Chriſt which have fallen within my obſervation, and which were neceſſary to be produced, in order to ſhew they were not taken by any eccleſiaſtical writers out of Apocryphal Goſpels. Some beſides theſe I have obſerved, which I regard not, as being no way prejudicial to the Canon, becauſe either *found in books evidently ſpurious and of uncertain age* (ſuch as thoſe in the Conſtitutions under the Apoſtles' names, of which the reader may take the following inſtance out of B. IV. c. 3. It is ſaid by the Lord, *Woe to thoſe that have and receive in hypocriſy, or who are able to ſupport themſelves, yet will receive of others, for both of them ſhall give an account to the Lord God in the day of judgment*); or *becauſe they are only the various readings of different copies, and interpolation of ſcribes in their ma-*

[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Teſt. §. 724, 725.

[b] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſt. Par. 3. p. 524.

nuſcripts, which were wrote long after the end of the fourth century, and of which the reader may ſee many inſtances in Dr. Mill's Notes on the Goſpels; ſee Matt. xx. 28. xxiv. 31. Mar. xvi. 8. Luk. vi. 5. Joh. iii. 5. vi. 25. But beſides either of theſe, there are now to be found in the Alcoran of Mahomet ſeveral *Diſcourſes*, *Sayings* and *Hiſtories*, as of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, which are not to be found in any of our preſent Goſpels. My deſign indeed obliges me not to take any notice of theſe, becauſe the impoſtor lived about two hundred years after that time, to which I have confined myſelf in the whole of this diſcourſe, and at a time when there was not the leaſt diſpute among the Chriſtians about the Canon of the New Teſtament, but all in every country univerſally agreed in receiving the ſame books as Scripture. However I thought it not unſuitable to preſent the reader with the following collection which I have made out of the Alcoran of the *Sayings*, *Hiſtories*, *Diſcourſes*, &c. which are therein aſcribed to Chriſt, his Apoſtles, &c. for the following reaſons:

1. Becauſe the paſſages being ſo large, and undoubtedly many, or moſt of them taken out of Apocryphal books, will afford us more clear and enlarged notions of thoſe books, as being made up of idle, fabulous, and incredible relations, which conſequently will be no ſmall ſtrengthening to our preſent books in the Canon, whoſe accounts are ſo much more conſiſtent and rational.

2. Hereby we ſhall ſee what wretched, perverſe, and unjuſt ideas the Mahometans are neceſſitated to have of the Chriſtian religion, who know little or nothing of Chriſt, but what is contained in the following collection.

3. We hereby alſo perceive how unfair the artifices were, which the impoſtor made uſe of againſt Chriſtianity in the compiling his Alcoran, who choſe to make his collections concerning Chriſt, and the Chriſtian affairs, out of thoſe ſpurious and Apocryphal books, which were at that time almoſt univerſally rejected by Chriſtians, and not from the genuine and allowed records of Chriſt's Apoſtles.

4. Such

4. Such a collection as the following having not yet been made (to my knowledge) by any, I thought it might be some entertainment to those who have any curiosity in these things, to see at one view what Mahomet and his followers believe concerning Jesus Christ, as it is contained in their Alcoran.

A Collection of the HISTORIES and SAYINGS of CHRIST, and Things relating to him, which are to be found in the Alcoran of MAHOMET.

[N. B. In this collection I have followed the last English translation of the Alcoran, done out of the French, which was translated out of Arabick by the Sieur de Ryer, Lord of Malezair, and resident for the French King at Alexandria.]

I. Chap. II. Intitled, *Of the Cow*, p. 72.

MAHOMET introduces God thus speaking, "*We gave* "*the Law to Moses, and after him sent many prophets;* "*we inspired knowledge into Jesus the son of Mary, and* "*strengthened him by the Holy Ghost; but you arose against* "*the prophets that came contrary to your affections; you belied* "*one part, and slew another.*" The same in part we read in the same chapter, p. 89.

II. Chap. III. Intitled, *Of the Lineage of Joachim*, p. 96, 97, &c.

GOD elected Adam and Noah, the lineage of Abraham, and the lineage of Joachim; the one proceedeth from the other; God knoweth and understandeth all things. Remember thou, how the wife of Joachim said, "*Lord, I vow* "*unto thee the fruit that is in my womb free and exempt from* "*all affairs, to serve thee in thy temple. Accept him from me,*

" *who offer him to thee with affection; thou underſtandeſt and* " *knoweſt all things.* When ſhe was delivered, ſhe ſaid, " *Lord, I am delivered of a daughter, thou knoweſt thou haſt* " *given her to me; I have named her Mary: I will preſerve* " *through thine aſſiſtance her and her poſterity from the malice* " *of the Devil. Accept her, Lord, with a pleaſing accepta-* " *tion, and cauſe her to produce good fruits.*" Zachary had the care of the education of this daughter; and whenſoever he went into his oratory, he there found a thouſand ſorts of different fruits of divers ſeaſons. He ſaid one day, " *O Mary!* " *Whence do theſe good things proceed?* She anſwered, *They* " *proceed from God, who enricheth without meaſure whom he* " *pleaſeth.*" Then Zachary prayed to the Lord, and ſaid, " *Lord, give me a progeny that may be pleaſing to thee, and* " *that may obſerve thy commandments; Lord, hear my pray-* " *ers.*" The Angel called to him, and ſaid to him, " *I de-* " *clare to thee from God, that thou ſhalt have a ſon called John,* " *he ſhall affirm the Meſſias to be the Word of God; that he* " *ſhall be a great perſon, chaſte, a prophet, and one of the Juſt.* " *Lord,* anſwered Zachary, *How ſhall I have a ſon, I am old,* " *and my wife is barren?*" The Angel ſaid to him, " *So God* " *doth as pleaſeth him. Lord,* ſaid Zachary, *Give me ſome* " *ſign of the conception of my wife. The ſign that I will give* " *thee,* anſwered the Angel, *ſhall be, That thou ſhalt not ſpeak* " *in three days, but by ſigns:*" Remember thou thy Lord often, praiſe him evening and morning. Remember thou, how the Angel ſaid, " *O Mary, God hath choſen and purified* " *thee above all the women of the world; O Mary, obey thy* " *Lord, praiſe him, and worſhip him with thoſe that worſhip* " *him.*" I relate to thee how the matter paſt; Thou wert not with the Miniſters of the Temple, when they caſt in their pens to draw lots, and to ſee which of them ſhould have the care of the education of Mary, neither when they entered upon this difficulty. Remember thou, how the Angels ſaid; " *O* " *Mary, God declareth unto thee a word, from which ſhall pro-* " *ceed the Meſſias, named Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, full of ho-* " *nour in this world, and that ſhall be in the other in the num-* " *ber of interceſſors with his Divine Majeſty. He ſhall ſpeak in*

" *the*

" *the cradle as a man betwixt thirty and fifty years, and ſhall be* " *in the number of the Juſt.*" She ſaid, " *Lord, how ſhall I* " *have a child without the touch of a man?*" He anſwered, " *So* " *God doth as pleaſeth him; when he createth any thing, he* " *ſaith, Be thou, and it is. I will teach him the Scriptures,* " *the myſteries of the Law, the Old Teſtament, and the Goſ-* " *pel, and he ſhall be a prophet ſent to the children of Iſrael.*" Jeſus ſaid to the children of Iſrael, " *I come to you with evi-* " *dent ſigns of my miſſion from your Lord; I will make unto* " *you of the ſlime of the earth the figure of a bird; I will blow* " *upon it, preſently it ſhall be a bird, and by the permiſſion of* " *God ſhall fly; I will heal them that are born blind, and the* " *leprous; I will raiſe again the dead; I will teach you what* " *you ſhall eat, and what you ought not to eat. This ſhall ſerve* " *you for inſtruction, if you believe in God. I am come to con-* " *firm the Old Teſtament, and what hath been taught you here-* " *tofore. Certainly it is lawful for you to eat things that have* " *heretofore been forbidden. I am come to you with ſigns of my* " *miſſion, that teſtify that I am truly ſent from your Lord.* " *Fear God, and obey me; God is my Lord, and your Lord,* " *worſhip him; this is the right way.*" When Jeſus knew their impiety, he ſaid, " *Who ſhall ſuſtain the law of God in* " *my abſence?*" The Apoſtles anſwered him, " *We will ſuſ-* " *tain the law of God; we believe in his Unity. Be thou a* " *witneſs before God, that we reſign ourſelves wholly to the* " *pleaſure of his divine Majeſty. Lord, we believe in what* " *thou haſt commanded, and we have followed the prophet, thy* " *Apoſtle; write us in the number of them that profeſs thy* " *law.*" The Jews conſpired againſt Jeſus, and God cauſed their conſpiracy to turn againſt them; he knoweth the deſigns of conſpirators. Remember thou, how the Lord ſaid, " *O Jeſus, I will cauſe thee to die; I will elevate thee to my-* " *ſelf, and remove thee far from infidels, and prefer thoſe who* " *have obeyed thee to infidels at the day of judgment*——Jeſus is with God. A little after, viz. p. 100. We believe in God in what he hath inſpired into us, in what he inſpired into Abraham, Iſmael, Iſaac, Jacob, and the tribes; in what was ordained by Moſes, by Jeſus, and generally all the prophets.

—Such as ſhall be impious towards Jeſus having believed the books of Moſes, and ſhall augment their impiety againſt Mahomet, ſhall never be converted, ſhall err eternally.

III. Chap. IV. Intitled, *Of Women*, p. 124.

GOD imprinted infidelity in their *(the Jews) hearts*; they ſhall never believe in his law, except very few of them, becauſe of their malice, and the blaſphemies they vomited againſt Mary; They ſaid, "*We have ſlain the Meſſiah, Jeſus the* "*ſon of Mary, the prophet and Apoſtle of God.*" Certainly they ſlew him not, neither crucified him; *they crucified one among them that reſembled him.* Such as doubt it are in a manifeſt error, and ſpeak not but through opinion. *Certainly they ſlew him not.* On the contrary, God took him up to himſelf; he is omnipotent and prudent in all his actions. Such as have the knowledge of the Scripture ought to believe in Jeſus before his death: he ſhall be a witneſs againſt them of their actions at the day of judgment. *In the next page*— The Meſſiah, Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, is a prophet and an Apoſtle of God, his word and ſpirit, which he ſent to Mary: believe therefore in God, and his prophets, and ſay not, *There be three Gods: put an end to that diſcourſe, you ſhall do well*; for there is but one God: praiſed be God, *he hath no ſon*; whatever is in heaven and earth obeyeth him: it is ſufficient that he is witneſs. The Meſſiah eſteemeth it no diſhonour to be the ſervant of God, neither the angel, nor the cherubim.

IV. Chap. V. Intitled, *The Chapter of the Table*, p. 129.

CERTAINLY, he that ſaith, that the *Meſſiah, the ſon of Mary, is God, is impious*; ſay to him, Who can hinder God *to exterminate the Meſſiah* and his mother, with whatſoever is in the earth, when it ſhall ſeem good to him?

V. The

V. The ſame Chapter, p. 132.

" *WE ſent, after many prophets, Jeſus the ſon of Mary, who* " *confirmed the antient Scriptures. To him we gave the Goſ-* " *pel full of light, to conduct the people to the right way, with a* " *confirmation of the Old Teſtament, a guide and inſtruction for* " *the righteous.*" They that follow the Goſpel ought to judge as it is commanded in the Goſpel.

VI. The ſame Chapter, p. 134, 135.

CERTAINLY they, who affirm *the Meſſiah, the ſon of Mary, to be God, are impious.* The Meſſiah commandeth the children of Iſrael *to worſhip God, his and their Lord.* The entrance into paradiſe is forbidden to him, that ſhall ſay, *God hath a companion equal to him*; hell ſhall be his habitation, and the unjuſt ſhall find none to protect them at the day of judgment. Such as affirm, *there are three Gods*, are impious: there is but one God. If they deſiſt not from ſuch diſcourſe, they ſhall burn in the fire of hell: if they turn and implore pardon of God, he will be gracious to them, and merciful. The Meſſiah, the ſon of Mary, is a *Prophet and Apoſtle of God*, like to the prophets that came before him; his mother is holy, and both of them did eat and drink.——The Infidels are accurſed by the tongue of David, and *of Meſſiah, the ſon of Mary*, becauſe of their diſobedience, &c.

VII. The ſame Chapter, p. 138, 139.

HE ſhall ſay to Jeſus, " *O Jeſus, ſon of Mary, remember* " *thou my grace towards thee, and thy mother: I ſtrengthened* " *thee with the Holy Ghoſt: thou ſpakeſt in thy cradle as a* " *man of forty or fifty years. Thee did I inſtruct in Scripture* " *and knowledge, the Old Teſtament and the Goſpel. Thou didſt* " *form of earth the figure of a bird, didſt breath upon it, and it* " *did fly; thou didſt cure the born blind, and the leprous, and* " *didſt revive the dead. I delivered thee from the Jews, when* " *thou didſt preach to them my commandments, and wroughteſt*

" *miracles, which the wicked affirmed to be magick and in-*
" *chantment. Remember how thou didſt command thy Apoſtles*
" *to believe in me, and obey my prophet, and how they ſaid,* We
" believe in one ſole God; *be thou witneſs that we entirely re-*
" *ſign ourſelves to the will of God.* Remember thou that the
" Apoſtles ſaid, *O Jeſus ſon of Mary, can thy Lord ſend us*
" *from heaven a table covered with meats to ſatisfy us?*" Jeſus
anſwered them, " *Fear God, if you believe in his Law.*" They
ſaid, " *We have an appetite, and deſire to eat of the food of*
" *heaven, for the repoſe of our hearts, and to know if thou ſpeak-*
" *eſt truth, of which we ſhall be witneſſes.*" Then ſaid he, " *O*
" *God, my Lord, cauſe to deſcend upon us from heaven a table*
" *covered with meat. This day ſhall be celebrated by us, and*
" *them that ſhall ſucceed. This ſhall be a ſign of thy omnipotency;*
" *enrich us with thy grace; thou poſſeſſeſt all treaſure.*" God
ſaid to him, " *I will cauſe to deſcend from heaven the food which*
" *thou deſireſt; and whoſoever ſhall be impious, ſhall be puniſhed*
" *with torments, that no man yet hath ſuffered.*" He ſhall ſay
at the day of judgment, " *O Jeſus, ſon of Mary! Didſt thou*
" *enjoin the people to worſhip thee and thy mother as two*
" *gods?*" Jeſus ſhall anſwer, " *Praiſed be thy name, I will*
" *take heed of ſpeaking what is not; thou knoweſt if I have*
" *ſaid it; thou art omniſcient; thou knoweſt what is in my*
" *ſoul, and I have no knowledge of what is in thee; I delivered*
" *nothing but what thou didſt command me to ſpeak,* viz. Wor-
" ſhip God your Lord and mine. *I am witneſs from the time*
" *I was in the world, until thou didſt cauſe me to die, thou didſt*
" *obſerve the deportments of the people; thou ſeeſt all; if thou*
" *chaſtiſeſt men, they are thy creatures; if thou doſt pardon*
" *them, thou art omnipotent and wiſe. Then ſhall God ſay, &c.*

VIII. Chap. VI. Intitled, *Of Gratifications*, p. 146.

" *WE gave knowledge to Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob his*
" *ſon. We before inſtructed Noah and his lineage in the right*
" *way. We taught it David, Solomon, Job, Joſeph, Moſes,*
" *Aaron, Zachary, St. John, Jeſus the ſon of Mary, Eliah,*
" *Iſhmael,*

" *Iſhmael, Joſhua, Jonas and Lot. We gratified them above* " *the reſidue of the world.*"

IX. Chap. IX. Intitled, *Of Converſion*, p. 178.

THE Jews have ſaid, that the *Son of God is moſt powerful:* the Chriſtians, that the *Meſſiah is the Son of God:* their words are like the words of Infidels that preceded them, but God ſhall lay upon them his curſe. Conſider how they blaſpheme; they adore their doctors and prieſts, *and the Meſſiah alſo, the ſon of Mary, who commanded them to worſhip one God alone*; there is but one ſole God, there is nothing equal to him.

X. Chap. XIX. Intitled, *Of Mary*, p. 246, *&c.*

ZACHARY, the ſervant of thy Lord, remembered his grace, when he in ſecret prayed to his Lord, and ſaid, " *Lord,* " *my bones are become feeble, and mine head is white with old* " *age*; *Lord, I never was rejected in my prayers, hear my* " *petition, give me a ſon to ſucceed me, that may be mine heir,* " *heir of the lineage of Jacob, and be pleaſing to thee. O Za-* " *chary! I declare unto thee, that thou ſhalt have a ſon named* " *John*; *no man hath yet been called by that name.*" He ſaid, " *Lord, how ſhall I have a ſon? My wife is barren, and I am* " *too old.*" It was anſwered him, " *The thing ſhall be as I* " *have ſaid unto thee*; *it is eaſy to thy Lord, who created thee.*" He ſaid, " *Lord, give me ſome ſign of the conception of my wife.*" He ſaid to him, " *Thou ſhalt not ſpeak for three nights.*" Then went he out of his oratory, and made ſigns to the people to make their prayers morning and evening. " *Oh John! learn* " *the Scripture with affection: we from his infancy gave him* " *knowledge, clemency, charity, piety, affection towards his fa-* " *ther and mother, and not violence and diſobedience. We bleſſed* " *the day of his nativity, the day that he ſhall die, and the day* " *that he ſhall riſe again.*" Remember thou what is written of Mary, " *She retired towards the eaſt into a place far remote* " *from her kindred, and took a veil to cover her. We ſent her* " *our ſpirit in the form of a man: ſhe was afraid, and ſaid, God* " *will*

" *will preſerve me from thee, if thou have his fear before thine* " *eyes.*" He ſaid, " *O Mary, I am the meſſenger of God, thy* " *Lord, who ſhall give thee a ſon active and prudent.*" She anſwered, " *How ſhall I have a ſon without the touch of a* " *man? I deſire not to be unchaſte.*" He ſaid, " *The thing* " *ſhall be as I have told thee; it is eaſy to thy Lord; thy ſon* " *ſhall be a token of the omnipotence of God, and of his ſpecial* " *grace toward ſuch as ſhall believe in his divine majeſty.*" She became with child, and retired ſome time into a place remote from people, where ſhe ſuſtained the dolours of child-birth at the foot of a date-tree, and ſaid, " *Why am not I dead?* " *wherefore am I not in the number of perſons forgotten?*" The angel ſaid to her, " *Afflict not thyſelf; God hath placed* " *a brook under thee; ſhake the foot of this palm, and the dates* " *ſhall fall; gather them up; eat and drink, and waſh thine* " *eyes: ſay unto them that thou ſhalt meet, that thou faſteſt, and* " *haſt made a vow not to ſpeak to any one, until the faſt be ac-* " *compliſhed.*" Her parents met her while ſhe bare her infant, and ſaid unto her, " *Oh Mary! behold a ſtrange thing: Oh* " *ſiſter of Aaron! Thy father did not command thee to do evil,* " *neither was thy mother unchaſte.*" She made ſigns to her infant to anſwer them: they ſaid, " *How ſhall the infant in* " *the cradle ſpeak?*" Then her infant ſpake, and ſaid, " *I am* " *the ſervant of God: he hath taught me the Scriptures, hath* " *made me a prophet, bleſſed me in all places, and commanded* " *me to pray unto him: he hath recommended to me purity* " *through the whole courſe of my life, and to honour my father* " *and mother; he hath not made me either violent, or malicious:* " *praiſed ſhall be the day of my birth, the day that I ſhall die,* " *and the day of my reſurrection.*" Thus ſpake Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, with truth, of which ye doubt; God approveth not the diſcourſe of them who ſay, *He hath a ſon.* Praiſed be God.

XI. Chap. XXIII. Intitled, *Of true Believers*, p. 271.

" *WE created Jeſus and Mary his mother; they are ſigns* " *of our unity; we eſtabliſhed them in an eminent place, where* " *they ſtayed near a fountain.*"

XII.

XII. Chap. XXXIII. Intitled, *Of bands of Soldiers*, p. 314.

REMEMBER thou, we received the promiſe of the Prophets, of thee, of Noah, of Abraham, of Moſes, and of Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, to worſhip but one God: we received a ſtrong promiſe. See to the ſame purpoſe, chap. 42. p. 356.

XIII. Chap. XLIII. Intitled, *Of Counſel*, p. 362.

THE people would not hearken to the ſon of Mary, when he ſpake to them by parable: they ſaid, *Our gods are more profitable to us than his lies and queſtions:* on the contrary, they were refractory. He is our ſervant; we conferred on him our grace, and made him like to the other prophets of the children of Iſrael. Had it pleaſed me, I had created angels on earth in your place. The coming of Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, ſhall be a ſign of the certainty of the day of judgment; doubt not concerning that day. He ſaid unto me, *Follow me, it is the right way; beware, leſt the devil ſeduce you; he is your open enemy; I come to teach you the commandments of God, to reſolve the doubts, and judge the differences that are among you: fear God, and obey him; he is your Lord, and mine; worſhip him, it is the right way.* The people doubted his doctrine, but miſery ſhall be upon the wicked. A little after, p. 363. If God have a ſon, whom ſhall we firſt adore? Praiſed be God, king of heaven and earth, the matter is not as the Infidels deliver it.

XIV. Chap. LVII. Intitled, *Of Iron*, p. 395.

WE ſent Noah and Abraham, &c. We ſent Jeſus, the ſon of Mary: we taught him the Goſpel: we put civility, clemency, and chaſtity into the hearts of them that followed him. We did not command them to keep virginity; they kept it of their own accord, becauſe of the deſire they had to pleaſe God. They have not obſerved their Law, as they ought; many have been diſobedient; but we have rewarded thoſe among them who believed. O ye that believe in Jeſus, fear God, and believe

lieve in his Prophet: ye ſhall have double the reward of God's mercy; he ſhall pardon your ſins, &c.

XV. Chap. LXI. Intitled, *Of Array*, p. 403.

REMEMBER thou, that Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, ſaid to the children of Iſrael, *I am the meſſenger of God; he hath ſent me to confirm the Old Teſtament, and to declare to you, that there ſhall come a Prophet after me, whoſe name ſhall be Mahomet.* When he came with miracles, reaſons moſt intelligible, and arguments infallible, they ſaid that he was a magician: who is more impious, than he that blaſphemeth againſt God?

A little after in the ſame chapter.

JESUS, the ſon of Mary, ſaid to his Apoſtles, *Who will maintain the Law of God with me? he ſhall be ſupported and protected of God.* The Apoſtles anſwered, *We will maintain it.* One part of the children of Iſrael believed in Jeſus, and another rejected his Law: *we gave ſuccour to them that believed againſt their enemies, and they were victorious.*

Theſe are the paſſages which are in the *Alcoran* concerning Chriſt, his *Doctrines, Diſcourſes, Actions, &c.* Concerning them I intend not to make any particular criticiſm, or remarks; but only to attempt the proof of this one propoſition, that *Mahomet took many or moſt of theſe paſſages out of ſome ſpurious and Apocryphal Goſpels of the Gnoſticks, and other antient Hereticks.*

This is a fact, as far as I know, yet unknown, yet unproved in the world, although it evidently appears to be of conſiderable conſequence. It is indeed a common obſervation, that in the compiling of the *Alcoran* the impoſtor made uſe of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Teſtament, and took many parts of his book out of both, which is indeed true; but he who will with any carefulneſs compare what he ſeems to have borrowed from the Scriptures with the accounts referred to in the Scriptures themſelves, will be not a little ſurpriſed

priſed to ſee the difference; and be the more eaſily induced to believe, that he *moſt commonly made uſe of ſome Apocryphal and ſpurious writings*. For the evidencing of this I propoſe the following remarks:

Firſt, Mahomet has not in any one place of the *Alcoran cited either of our preſent Goſpels, or any book of the New Teſtament* by name. This I aſſert upon a ſtrict peruſal of the whole book, although I have obſerved five or ſix paſſages therein, which ſeem very plainly to be taken thence: ſo for inſtance, ſpeaking of charity, he adds, *It will cover many ſins* (Chap. II. *Of the Cow*, p. 91.); which are the very words of St. Peter in his firſt Epiſtle, cap. iv. ver. 8. *Charity ſhall cover a multitude of ſins*. Chap. VII. *Of Priſons*, p. 157. he makes uſe of our Saviour's metaphor, which is in three of our Goſpels [a], *Of a Camel's paſſing through the Eye of a Needle*: and in the ſame page manifeſtly borrowed his deſcription of the future ſtate of men *from our Saviour's parable concerning Dives and Lazarus*, Luk. xvi. Particularly, when he ſpeaks of the *Aaraf*, or *Separation between the bleſſed and damned*, he alludes to thoſe words of Abraham to Dives, ver. 26. *Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed*: when he makes the damned to cry to the bleſſed, *Give us of the water which you drink*, he alludes to that, ver. 24. where the rich man is repreſented, as crying to *Abraham to ſend Lazarus, that he might dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool his tongue*. Again, to omit other inſtances, Chap. XIV. *Of Abraham*, p. 219. he borrows that phraſe of Jude, ver. 4. *of turning the grace of God into laſciviouſneſs*.

Secondly, *It was utterly inconſiſtent with the whole intention of Mahomet's impoſture, that he ſhould in any one place cite by name any one of our Goſpels, or indeed any of the books of the New Teſtament*. This is plain to any one who is acquainted but in the leaſt degree with the Alcoran. For whereas in all the genuine writings of the New Teſtament, Jeſus Chriſt is repreſented as God, and as the Son of God, Mahomet continually obliges his followers to believe the contrary: he many

[a] Matth. xix. 24. Mark x. 25. Luk. xviii. 25.

times

times denies him to be either God, or the Son of God, and ſometimes pronounces everlaſting damnation and miſery againſt thoſe who believed otherwiſe. Beſides the paſſages above, Numb. IV, VI, IX, XI, and XIV, I have obſerved near twenty places in the Alcoran, where Mahomet expreſſes and inſinuates the ſame; which, for the ſake of the curious reader, I have ſet down at the bottom of the page [a]. Now the reaſon why the impoſtor thus frequently and ſtrenuouſly declares againſt the Scripture account of Chriſt's divinity, appears evidently to be this; becauſe he, having it in his intention to appear a perſon more great and eminent than Jeſus Chriſt, ſaw this impoſſible to be effected, if the accounts in the genuine records of Chriſtianity, and the received writings of the Apoſtles, were credited and looked upon as true. As therefore he did not appeal to theſe books, ſo we perceive plainly that it was inconſiſtent with his deſigns to do it.

Thirdly, *Mahomet was very likely to be furniſhed with the ſpurious books, and Apocryphal writings of the New Teſtament.* It is indeed certain that himſelf could neither write nor read, as he expreſsly ſays of himſelf twice in the ſame chapter of the Alcoran (Chap. VII. p. 165.), where God is firſt introduced, commanding perſons *to believe in his prophet, who could neither write nor read*; and a little after, he exhorts them in theſe words, *Believe in God, and in his prophet, who can neither read nor write:* but though he was thus a perfectly rude and illiterate barbarian, he was artful enough to procure proper aſſiſtances for his work. This is ſo notorious, that it ſeems by his own words to have been what he was commonly reproached with, viz. *that he did not make the Alcoran himſelf, but others helped him.* So in the chapter intitled, *Of the Alcoran* (Chap. XXV.) In the beginning we read, *They ſay that the Alcoran is but a fable of thine own invention, with the aſſiſtance of ſome other perſon, but they lie and blaſpheme:* but notwithſtanding this character of his oppoſers,

a Chap. iv. pag. 115, 121. Ch. vi. p. 148, 152. Ch. x. p. 193, 195. Ch. xiv. p. 219. Ch. xvi. p. 228. Ch. xvii. p. 235. Ch. xviii. p. 239, 242. Ch. xxvii. p. 289. Ch. xxxi. p. 310. Ch. xxxvii. p. 335. Ch. xli. p. 352.

the

the fact is certain. The commentators on this place of the Alcoran ſay, the perſons here meant, who were aſſiſtants to Mahomet, were the ſervants of a certain ſword-ſmith at Mecca, who were Chriſtians, with whom Mahomet was uſed often to converſe, for the better informing himſelf from them in the Old and New Teſtament [a]. Beſides theſe, we find he had the aſſiſtance not only of a Perſian Jew, named Abdia Ben Salon, afterwards called Abdollah Ebn Salem, who furniſhed him with his ſtories out of the Old Teſtament and Talmud, but alſo of a Chriſtian monk, commonly known among Chriſtians by the name Sergius, but among the Eaſterns by the name Bahira; from whom he received his accounts of Chriſtianity [b], as well as from Joannes Antiochenus [c], and others. As to Sergius, we are aſſured [d] he was a Neſtorian monk of Syria, who, being baniſhed from his monaſtery, fled to Mecca, and there entered into confederacy with Mahomet. Hence it cannot be thought ſtrange, that he ſhould be furniſhed with the ſtories of Chriſt, by theſe Chriſtian accomplices, which he made uſe of; and if we conſider the character of Sergius, who was his principal aſſiſtant, it will appear evident that he gave him his relations concerning Chriſt only out of ſuch as were Apocryphal books. Sergius was a Neſtorian: the diſtinguiſhing tenet of that ſect was, that *Chriſt was not God*; and this was the impious aſſertion of many of thoſe hereticks, who forged the Apocryphal writings which I have examined in the preceding work. This was the doctrine of Cerinthus [e], of the Nazarenes [f], Ebionites [g], Theodotus Byzantius, and his followers [h], the Alogians [i], and many others of thoſe hereticks, who made uſe of ſuch books to ſupport their hereſy, as the *Goſpel of Cerinthus*, or *Nazarenes*, *the Preaching and Revelation of Peter*, &c. The Neſtorians

[a] See Dean Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 35, 36.

[b] See Vincent. Bellovacen. Specul. Hiſtor. l. 23. cap. 41.——66. apud Forbes. Inſtit. Hiſtor. Theolog. lib. 4. c. 3. p. 177. and Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 37, &c.

[c] Spanheim. Hiſt. Chriſtian. Seculi ſeptimi. p. 1209.

[d] Prideaux. Loc. cit.

[e] Tertull. de Præſcript. c. 48. & Epiphan. Hæreſ. 28.

[f] Id. Hæreſ. 29.

[g] Id. Hæreſ. 30.

[h] Tertull. de Præſcript. c. ult.

[i] Epiphan. Hæreſ. 51.

therefore

therefore being hereticks of the ſame ſort, very probably made uſe of the ſame books; and conſequently Mahomet, being aſſiſted by Sergius, was very likely to be furniſhed with the old ſpurious and Apocryphal books.

Fourthly, Although the impoſtor mentions no books from whence he borrows his accounts of Chriſt, *yet in one place he cites a hiſtory of the Virgin Mary, and of Chriſt, as being written*, i. e. as out of ſome book. The place I mean is that Chap. XIX. *Of the Alcoran*, above in my collection, Numb. X. He introduces the hiſtory of Mary thus, *Remember thou* what is written *of Mary*, &c. This he did, I ſuppoſe, through forgetfulneſs, becauſe I have not obſerved another ſuch place in the Alcoran.

Fifthly, Several of the paſſages in the preceding collection out of the Alcoran may be certainly proved to have been in Apocryphal books: for inſtance,

1. The ſtory of the wife of Joachim, Numb. II. above, viz. *her devoting Mary to the ſervice of the Temple*, ſeems plainly to be taken either out of the Prot-evangelion of James, Chap. IV. or the Goſpel of the Birth of Mary, Chap. II. (which are two Apocryphal books now extant, and will be produced in the third Part of this work) in both which this ſame account is related.

2. The account of *Chriſt's ſpeaking in his cradle*, Numb. III. is related in the Goſpel tranſlated out of Arabick by Mr. Sike, under the title of *The Goſpel of the Infancy of Chriſt*, Chap. I. which ſhall alſo be in the next Part.

3. The ſtory of Chriſt's *making a bird out of the ſlime of the earth, when a child*, related Numb. II. and Numb. VII. is alſo in the ſame *Goſpel of Chriſt's Infancy*, Chap. XXXVI. and the *Goſpel of the Infancy* in Greek, under the name of *Thomas*, publiſhed by Cotelerius, Chap. II.

4. The ridiculous fiction, Numb. III. concerning *Chriſt's not being crucified, but another crucified inſtead of him*, appears manifeſtly to be taken out of ſome old Apocryphal book. However ſurpriſing the account may ſeem, it is fact, that Baſilides, and ſeveral others of the antient hereticks, not long after Chriſt, poſitively affirmed that Chriſt was not crucified,

but

but Simon the Cyrenean in his room; who, when he carried the croſs of Chriſt, was ſo transformed into the likeneſs of Chriſt, that he was taken for him, and crucified in his ſtead; and at the ſame time Jeſus took the form and appearance of Simon, and ſtood by laughing at their miſtake. This we find in Irenæus [a], Tertullian [b], and Epiphanius [c]; and I have above proved [d], that there were a ſect of Chriſtians called *Docetæ*, in the very beginning of the ſecond century, for this reaſon, that they *thought Chriſt did not really ſuffer, but only in appearance.* This opinion of Chriſt, I have ſhewn in the place cited, was very probably in the Goſpel of Baſilides, and the Goſpel of Peter, if they were not the ſame book; and the incomparable Photius tells us, *he read it in ſo many words in the ſpurious Acts of the Apoſtles, forged by Leucius Charinus* [e]. From all which I argue that Mahomet, or his aſſiſtants for him, dealt in Apocryphal books, and took this paſſage thence; becauſe there were not, that I know of, at that time in the world, any ſet of perſons who entertained that impious opinion, that *Chriſt did not ſuffer*, from whom they could have it. I cannot forbear remarking here, that though Mahomet, according to his Apocryphal books, does in this place deny the death and crucifixion of Chriſt, affirming another was crucified in his room, and he immediately tranſlated by God to heaven; yet in another place, viz. that above produced, Numb. II. he introduces God himſelf, ſaying to Jeſus, *I will cauſe thee to die, I will raiſe thee to myſelf*, &c. than which nothing can be a more palpable and groſs contradiction. But the Alcoran is exceeding full of ſuch, and ſo are thoſe Apocryphal books, out of which it was compiled.

Thus I have endeavoured to ſhew, whence Mahomet took his accounts of Chriſt. If any ſhould yet enquire, why he did not cite and name the Apocryphal books from which he borrowed? I anſwer;

1. *That he was ever willing to gratify and be complacent to the Chriſtians:* this is a common obſervation; and as Dean

[a] Adv. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 23.
[b] De Præſcr. adv. Hær. c. 46.
[c] Hæreſ. 24. §. 3.
[d] Par. II. Ch. XXI.
[e] See the place produced at large, in the place laſt cited.

Prideaux well obſerves [a], *It was his uſage through the whole ſcene of his impoſture, to flatter the Chriſtians on all occaſions.* Now to have cited thoſe accounts out of books, as of authority among the Chriſtians, which really were not ſo, but inſtead of that rejected by them, would have expoſed him to their ſevereſt reſentment, and ſo obſtructed the reception of his ſcheme.

2. The truth is; *Mahomet durſt not with ſafety to his deſign cite any book.* His doing this had been a proof, that he was either able to read himſelf, or had ſome aſſiſtants with him in the compiling of his work; both of which he denied, as his followers do ſtill; who, when they are preſſed, how without miracles they can prove his miſſion, give this anſwer, *That inſtead of all miracles is the Alcoran:* for that Mahomet, who was an illiterate perſon, that could neither write nor read, or that any man elſe, by human wiſdom alone, ſhould be able to compoſe a book ſo excellent in eloquence and doctrine, as they will have that to be, is what they will not admit poſſible [b].

COROLL. I. From the foregoing diſcourſe it is eaſy to ſee the reaſon and foundation of the *Mahometans charging the Chriſtians, with having altered and corrupted the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt.* This is a charge frequently laid againſt us in the Alcoran (ſee Chap. III. p. 100. Chap. V. p. 129.), and has been commonly obſerved by thoſe who have wrote of the Mahometans. See Grotius [c], Forbes [d], Prideaux [e], Toland [f], and Mangey [g]. Sir John Chardin [h] gives us a more particular account; the ſubſtance of which is, "That though "God hath ſent into the world 124000 prophets, there were "only five of them who had the laws of publick worſhip

[a] Life of Mahomet, p. 53. et 132.
[b] Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 31.
[c] De Verit. Relig. Chriſt. l. 6. §. 3.
[d] Inſtitut. Hiſtor. Theolog. lib. 4. c. 4, &c.
[e] Life of Mahomet, p. 15, 16.
[f] Nazarenus, ch. 4.
[g] Remarks on Nazaren. c. 6.
[h] Travels to Perſia and the Eaſt-Indies. Vid. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. P. 3. p. 367.

"given

" given them, viz. Abraham, Moſes, David, Jeſus Chriſt, " and Mahomet: that theſe books were ſent to theſe five " prophets by the angel Gabriel; and each, when it came, ſu- " perſeded the tie of the other; that theſe books were either " ſent by little and little, as the Alcoran [a]; or by diſtinct " books, as the five of Moſes; or altogether, as the Goſpel. " That when God took any of theſe prophets to himſelf, he " took the ſacred book alſo, and only left a copy, except the " Alcoran; which, being the laſt book that was to be given, " was preſerved. Hence they imagine no truly divine book " on earth, but the Alcoran. They nevertheleſs very much " reſpect our Old and New Teſtament, kiſs them, and lay " them upon their heads. They acknowledge them to con- " tain many truths, but they allow them not ſo much autho- " rity; becauſe they ſay, *they are not the ſame which the pro-* " *phets Moſes and Jeſus delivered, but ſome corrupted abridg-* " *ments*. Hence the Mahometan doctors hold the reading of " them vain and unprofitable; and ſome of them judge it cri- " minal." *And a little after*; " As to the Goſpel, which " they call *Ingil*, they hold, that Chriſt took it with him to " heaven again; that the Apoſtles wrote down each of them " what they could remember; and that this is the Goſpel " which the Chriſtians have now, *different from that which* " *Chriſt took up to heaven*, and only an hiſtorical account of " what that prophet ſaid and did; *which hath been ſince cor-* " *rupted in many places by the firſt Chriſtians.*" To prove " this, they ſay, we need do no more than compare the Goſ- " pel with the other ſacred books; for in them God ſtill " ſpeaks, and not the prophet; whereas the Goſpel is nothing " but a hiſtory of what the prophet did. They add, that the " true Goſpel began with theſe words, *O prophet, I have* " *ſent my meſſenger, or angel, before thee, to prepare the way*, " &c. An idle fancy, founded upon the firſt words of St. " Mark's Goſpel."

[a] So Mahomet ſays himſelf. Alcoran, ch. 25. p. 281.

Agreeable to the preceding account of Sir John Chardin, is that of Mr. Herbelot in his *Bibliotheque Orientale* in French [a]. "By the word Goſpel (in their language *Ingil*) "in the Alcoran, the Muſſulmen do not underſtand that which "is among the Chriſtians, *for they believe that corrupted*; "but a *chimerical Goſpel, which, they ſay, was ſent from God* "*by Jeſus Chriſt, and of which there is nothing remaining but* "*what is cited from the Alcoran*——That which they cite "from the Goſpel, whether hiſtorical or doctrinal, hath ſome "foundation in our Goſpels; but they always give it ſome "new turn, that it may not appear to be borrowed from the "Chriſtians, and that they may perſuade the ignorant that they "have among them the true originals, which they never yet "were able to produce——But they among them, who are "better inſtructed in Chriſtianity, will confeſs, that the Goſ-"pel which the Chriſtians now have, as well as that which "was in the time of Mahomet, is the true Goſpel of Jeſus "Chriſt, and has nothing elſe in it; only they aſſert, *that it* "*is altered and corrupted by the Chriſtians*, as well as the "Old Teſtament by the Jews."

Thus univerſal is the charge of the Mahometans againſt the Chriſtians' Goſpels, that they are altered and corrupted. It is avowed and eſpouſed by that intolerable ſophiſt and juggler in writing, Mr. Toland; which, though it may be eaſily anſwered by other arguments, ſeems no way capable of ſo full an anſwer, as by the preceding account. For if, as I have largely proved, Mahomet took his account of Chriſt out of Apocryphal and ſpurious books; and neither theſe accounts, nor any thing like them, are to be found in our preſent Goſpels; his followers were under a ſort of neceſſity of falling into this miſtake concerning the Chriſtian books: for when, upon a ſearch made into them, they found none of thoſe things which are ſaid concerning Chriſt, or aſcribed to Chriſt in the Alcoran, they muſt neceſſarily believe, either (1.) That *they were forgeries of Mahomet*; or (2.) That *he took them out of*

[a] Apud Fabric. loc. cit. p. 370, &c.

ſome

ſome ſpurious and fabulous books; or (3.) That *he took them out of the genuine Goſpels, which are ſince that time altered.* But as no one can ſuppoſe they would conclude either of the former, they muſt inevitably conclude the laſt; and ſo we at once ſee, how it came to paſs they charged our Scriptures with corruption, and how groundleſs that charge is.

COROLL. II. Hence it appears, that Mr. Toland's *notion in his Nazarenus*, that the Goſpel of Barnabas, which is in Prince Eugene's poſſeſſion (of which above, Part II. Ch. VIII.), is that referred to in the Alcoran, and by the Mahometans, is *perfectly whimſical and ridiculous*; for beſides that that Goſpel appears plainly a late Mahometan forgery, it is evident Mahomet took his accounts from other books.

After my preceding collection out of the Alcoran, of the *ſayings* and *hiſtories* of CHRIST, and obſervations thereupon, it may not be unſuitable to add the four *Sayings* or *Diſcourſes* aſcribed to CHRIST by the Mahometan doctors, which are collected by Levinus Warner [a], and referred to by Mr. Toland in his *Nazarenus* [b], and afterwards tranſcribed by Fabricius [c]. They are theſe:

I.

Dixit Jeſus, filius Mariæ, ſuper quo pax ſit, Qui opibus inhiat, ſimilis eſt ei, qui aquam maris potat; is, quo plus bibit, ſitim plus provocat, nec bibere deſiſtit, donec pereat.

Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, upon whom be peace, ſaid, *He, who thirſts after riches, is like to him who drinks ſea-water. Such a perſon, the more he drink, the more he increaſeth his thirſt; nor will he give over drinking, till he die.*

[a] Not. ad Centur. Proverb. Perſicor. Proverb. 61.

[b] Ch. vii.

[c] Cod. Apoc. N.T. P. iii. p. 394.

II.

Dixit Jeſus, filius Mariæ, Joanni, filio Zachariæ, Cum quiſpiam aliquid de te commemorans vera loquitur, Deum lauda; ſi mendacia profert, Deum magis lauda; augetur enim opus tuum in catalogo operum tuorum, idque ſine omni tuo labore, hoc eſt, illius bona opera in catalogum tuum referuntur.

Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, ſaid to John, the ſon of Zacharias, *When any one relates that which is true concerning thee, praiſe God; if he ſays that which is falſe concerning thee, praiſe God the more; for ſo an addition is made to thy works in the catalogue of them, and that without any pains of thine; that is, his good works ſhall be placed in the catalogue of thine.*

III.

Jeſu beatæ memoriæ aliquando mundus viſus eſt inſtar anus decrepitæ; cui ille, Quot, inquit, maritos habuiſti? Ipſa adeo multos ſe habuiſſe reſpondet, ut numerari non poſſent. Mortui igitur illi, inquit Jeſus, te reliquerunt? Imo vero, illa ait, ego occidi et ſuſtuli illos. Tum Jeſus, Mirum, inquit, eſt adeo inſipientes eſſe alios, ut cum videant quomodo reliquos tractaris, tui tamen amore flagrent, et de aliis exemplum non capiant.

On a certain time, the world did appear to Jeſus of bleſſed memory in the form of a decrepit old woman, to whom he ſaid, *How many huſbands have you had?* She anſwered, She had ſo many that they could not be numbered. Jeſus replied, *So then, are they all dead, and have left you?* Yes, replied ſhe, I have killed them, and taken them off. Then ſaid Jeſus, *It is ſtrange others ſhould be ſo infatuated, that when they perceive how you have dealt with others, they ſhould be ſo fond of you, and not take warning by others.*

IV.

Tempore Jeſu, tres aliquando iter faciebant, qui theſaurum

Upon a time in the days of Jeſus, there were three perſons

invenientes, Eſurimus, inquiunt, ideoque unus ex nobis abibit, et cibum coemet. Unus ille, qui ibat allatum cibum, Conſultum, inquit, erit, ut cibum veneno inficiam, quo veſcentes illi moriantur, egoque ſolus theſauro potiar. Quod fecit; cibo venenum admiſcuit: ſed et duo illi viri inter ſe convenerant, ut cum cibum apportaret, eum interficerent, quo ſoli theſauro fruerentur. Cum igitur cibum veneno mixtum afferret, eum occiderunt; et ipſi cibum illum venenatum comedentes, ſtatim ſunt mortui. Cum ecce Jeſus tranſiens cum apoſtolis ſuis dicebat, Hæc eſt conditio mundi! Ecce quomodo ternos hoſce tractaverit, et ipſe tamen poſt hos in ſtatu ſuo perſeveret. Væ illi, qui petit mundum ex mundo.

ſons travelling, and having found a treaſure, they ſaid, *We are hungry; let one of us go and buy food.* He who went to fetch the food, ſaid, *I will contrive to mix poiſon with the food, that when they eat thereof, they may die, and I alone poſſeſs all the treaſure.* Accordingly he did, and mixed poiſon with the food. In the mean time the two men agreed, that when he brought back the meat, they would kill him; ſo, when he brought back the meat mixed with poiſon, they ſlew him; and they, when they eat the poiſoned meat, preſently died. At which time Jeſus paſſing by with his Apoſtles, ſaid, *Such is the condition of the world! See how it has dealt with theſe three perſons, and it continues ſtill the ſame. Wo unto him who ſeeks the world by the world* (or by worldly means).

INDEX

TO THE

FIRST VOLUME.

A

ABDIAS, his ridiculous hiſtory of the Lives of the Apoſtles, 315.

ACE, ACO, ACCO, ACU, were the Syriack and antient names of Ptolemais, 103.

ADULTEROUS Woman, hiſtory of, John viii. wanting in many antient Greek MSS. and eſpecially in the preſent Syriack Verſion, 111.

ALCORAN, a collection of the Hiſtories and Sayings of Chriſt, and things relating to him, to be found in it, 451, &c. Vide MAHOMET.

ALOGIANS, their error concerning St. John's Goſpel, 8.

AMBROSE places the Goſpel of Matthias among ſpurious and rejected books, 254. cenſures the Goſpel of Thomas, 398, n. Apocryphal books cited by him, 33. why he read them, 129, n.

AMIRA, his obſervation on the Chaldee and Syriack languages, 93, n.

ANABATICON and Revelation of Paul the ſame book, 126. Vide PAUL.

ANDREW, his Acts and Goſpels not extant, 119. his Acts cenſured as Apocryphal by Euſebius, 148, n. by Philaſtrius, *ibid.* n. by Epiphanius, 149, n. by Pope Gelaſius, 150, n. Other books under his name declared ſpurious by Auſtin and Innocent I. 152, 153, n. his Goſpel Apocryphal by Gelaſius, 153, n.

ANONYMOUS author of the works under the name of Dionyſius, his catalogue of Canonical books, 62.

ANONYMOUS author, his fragment of the Preaching of Peter, 352.

APELLES, an Apocryphal Goſpel under his name not extant, 119, n. nor mentioned by any writer till Jerome, 156, n. His age and principles, 157, 158, n.

APOCRYPHAL books extant in the Apoſtles' times, 23. A catalogue of thoſe mentioned in the ſecond century, 30. which are not extant, *ibid.* of thoſe which are extant, 37. Reaſons why ſo many

many were extant ſo early in the Chriſtian Church, 38. what books are ſo, 63 to 85. Some mentioned though not extant, 119 to 156. made out of the preſent Canonical, 127. never appealed to by Chriſtian writers, as of authority, 128. cited by the Fathers to ſhew their learning, 129. or becauſe the perſons againſt whom they wrote, did receive them, &c. *ibid.*

APOLLONIUS, his account of Themiſon and his Epiſtle, 391.

APOSTLES TWELVE, Apocryphal Goſpel according to them not extant, 119. ſeems to have been a different name of Matthew's Hebrew Goſpel, 126, n. An account of it by Origen, Ambroſe, and Jerome, 158, 159, n. Their Acts under the names of Leucius, Lenticius, Leontius, and Leuthon, one and the ſame book, 236. the ſame with the Apocryphal Acts under the names of John, Andrew, and Thomas, &c. 240.

APOTACTICKS, a ſort of hereticks ſo called, 22. They eſteemed the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew above other Scriptures, and why, 151.

ARABICK, a dialect of the Old Hebrew, 92.

ATHANASIUS, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 33. his catalogue of Canonical books of the New Teſtament, 61, n. condemns Peter's Acts for Apocryphal, 325, n. 393, n. does the like by thoſe of Thomas, 393. As alſo his Goſpel, 398, n.

ATHENAGORAS aſcribes a particular ſaying to our Saviour, 436.

AUSTIN, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 35. His catalogue of Canonical books, 62. His opinion of Chriſt's Epiſtle to Peter and Paul, 188. Diſputation with Fauſtus the Manichee, 193, n. He proves the ſpurious Acts of the Apoſtles to have been written by Leucius, 240. His account of the revelation of Paul, 317, 320, n.

B

BALUZIUS, his conjecture concerning the decree of Gelaſius, 156.

BARNABAS, his Goſpel not extant, 119. An account of it by Gelaſius, 160. Two ſuppoſed fragments of it, 161. Another large Italian one, wherein Mahomet is named for the Paraclete, 164. therefore reaſonably concluded a Mahometan forgery, 167. The author's and Dr. Mangey's conjectures concerning the original of it, 169, 170.

BARONIUS, his high opinion of the Nazarene Goſpel, 284, n.

BARTHOLOMEW, his writings and Goſpel not extant, 119. ſeems to have been a different name of the Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew, 126. The book under his name proved ſpurious, 171. and by Jerome and Gelaſius accounted Apocryphal, 172, n. is the Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew interpolated, *ibid.* n.

BARUCH, Book of, its error concerning the captivity, 10.

BASILIDES, his error concerning the crucifixion of Chriſt, 12, n. his Goſpel not extant, 119, 177. only juſt cited among the Apocryphal books by Origen, Ambroſe, and Jerome, 175, n. His age and tenets, 176, n. his commentaries, &c. 177.

BAXTER, Mr. a citation from him concerning people's remiſſneſs in enquiring into the genuineneſs of the Scriptures, 14.

BEDA, his ſentiments of the Hebrew or Nazarene Goſpel, 283, n.

BEZA, his opinion that St. Paul wrote ſeveral other Epiſtles beſides thoſe we now have, 136, 137, n. Of a ſaying of Chriſt mentioned by St. Paul, Acts xx. 35. p. 409, n.

BURNET, Biſhop, a citation out of him

him concerning the neceſſity of tradition to eſtabliſh the Canon of the New Teſtament, 58, n.

C

CAIANITES, a ſect of the Gnoſticks, &c. 234. forged a piece under the name of Judas, *ibid.* their tenets, 235, n.

CAJETAN queſtioned the authority of the Revelation, 9.

CAIUS, Preſbyter of Rome, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 31.

CALVIN queſtioned the authority of the Revelation, 9. ſuppoſed St. Paul to have written more Epiſtles than we now have, 136, 137, n.

CANON of the New Teſtament more difficult to ſettle, than that of the Old, 2, 3. The original of the word, and when firſt applied to Scripture, 19, 20. Primitive Chriſtians did well agree about books Canonical, 41. and did generally receive the ſame for ſuch, as we do now, *ibid.* *Tradition of the antients, the principal method of determining it*, 53. A demonſtrative indication of a true Canon, 63. Canonical books, which, *ibid.* none of them loſt, 130. A noted objection to this anſwered, 133. The bare citation of a book in ſacred writings does not prove it Canonical, 135.

CANTERBURY, preſent Archbiſhop of, a citation out of him concerning the Apoſtolical Fathers, 5. a miſtake of him in putting the word *Soul* for the Greek *σφραγίδα*, 418.

CAPELLUS, his proof of the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, &c. 116, n. thought St. Paul to have wrote other Epiſtles than thoſe we now have, 136, 137, n.

CARTHAGE, Council Third, its catalogue of Canonical books, 62.

CASAUBON, a citation from him concerning the early riſe of Apocryphal books, 40. his opinion of the Nazarene Goſpel, 284, n.

CASSIODORUS, his conjecture concerning the Hypotypoſes, 374, n.

CAVE, Dr. thinks the decree of Gelaſius concerning Apocryphal books to be ſpurious, 156, n. His miſtake in thinking the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul to be two different books, 319, n. his opinion that the Judgment of Peter was the ſame book with the Shepherd of Hermas, rejected, 336. his favourable ſentiment of the Preaching of Peter, 356, n.

CELSUS, his objection to our Saviour, as a magician, 191. banters the Chriſtians under the name of Sibylliſts, 364, n.

CERINTHUS, his Goſpel and Revelation not extant, 120. ſeems to have been a different name for the Hebrew Goſpel of Matthew, 126. mentioned only by Epiphanius, 178, n. his age, tenets, &c. 179. A ſtory of St. John the Apoſtle and him at Epheſus, *ibid.* n. he is referred to in Acts xv. *ibid.* his Goſpel the ſame with the Nazarenes, 181. his Revelation mentioned only by Caius or Gaius the Preſbyter, 182, n. not the ſame as St. John's, 183. but a ridiculous forgery compiled out of the Canonical Revelation, 184, 185, n.

CHALDEAN Language. Vide SYRIACK.

CHARDIN, Sir JOHN, his account of the charge of the Mahometans againſt the Chriſtians for corrupting the Goſpel, 466, n.

CHARINUS. Vide LEUCIUS.

CHEMNITIUS, his opinion of the ſaying of Chriſt mentioned by St. Paul, Acts xx. 35. p. 409, n.

CHRIST our Saviour, his Epiſtle to Peter and Paul, ſome other books under his name, an Epiſtle of his produced by the Manicheans, and a hymn, which they pretend he

he taught his diſciples, not extant, 120, 186. not mentioned till Auſtin's time, except an Epiſtle to Abgarus, &c. *ibid.* that to Peter and Paul proved out of Auſtin to be a ridiculous forgery, 188. another book mentioned under his name, 190. he is falſely charged by the Jews and Celſus, as a magician, 191. an idle trite ſtory of the former to the ſame purpoſe, *ibid.* a ſpurious Epiſtle of his among the Manichees, 193, n. a hymn forged by the Priſcillianiſts under his name proved ſpurious, 195, n. a ſaying of his mentioned by St. Paul, 408. others aſcribed to him in the Epiſtle of Barnabas, 409. others by Clemens, ſuppoſed to be the ſame mentioned by St. Paul, 412. a fragment in his name cited by Irenæus, 416, n. a diſcourſe aſcribed to him by Papias, 422. another by the ſame, 423. a ſaying of his out of Juſtin Martyr, 425. hiſtory of his baptiſm by the ſame, 428. another concerning him in his younger years, by the ſame, 430. a ſaying of him in Irenæus, 433. hiſtory of his age in the ſame, 434. a ſaying aſcribed to him in Athenagoras, and a continuation of it by Pfaffius, 436. another by Clemens Alexandrinus, 437. another by the ſame, 442. another cited by moſt of the antient Fathers, 438. hiſtory of him and his parents by Origen, 444. of his relations according to the fleſh in Epiphanius, 445. an anſwer of the Apoſtles to him in Jerome, 447. hiſtories and ſayings of, and things relating to him, to be found in the Alcoran of Mahomet, 451. four particular ſayings aſcribed to him by the Mahometan doctors, 469.

CHRYSOSTOM makes no mention of the adulterous woman in John viii. p. 111.

CLARKE, Dr. a miſtake of his concerning Mr. Dodwell, rectified, 5. n.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 30. makes no mention of the adulterous woman in John viii. p. 111. his teſtimonies of the Goſpel of the Egyptians, 198. n. his interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 1. and 1 Tim. iv. 3. p. 209. n. mentions the traditions of Matthias, 255. His account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Goſpel, 268. n. does not appeal to the Hebrew Goſpel as of any authority, 297. cites fragments of *the Preaching of Peter*. 345. Obſervation on the Hypotypoſes of Clemens, &c. 379. n. that book not his, 373. the citation of it by Theodotus examined, 375.

CLEMENS ROMANUS, contemporary with St. Paul, his teſtimony of St. Paul's firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, contrary to the opinions of many modern learned men, 138.

CLEOBIUS, author of ſeveral Apocryphal books, 39.

LE CLERC, Mr. his opinion of ſeveral Epiſtles of St. Paul, not extant, and ſanguine remark on thoſe that are, examined, 136. His ſentiments of the Egyptian Goſpel, 203. cenſure of Dr. Grabe, 208, n. His opinion the ſame with Dr. Whitby's concerning the Nazarene Goſpel, 288, n.

COLLINS, Dr. was of opinion that St. Paul wrote an Epiſtle to the Corinthians, previous to thoſe two extant, 137, n.

CONSTANTINE Emperor, cites a Greek acroſtick concerning Chriſt, 364, n.

CORINTHIANS, a ſpurious Epiſtle of theirs to Paul, and another of Paul to them, 144, 145.

COSIN, Dr. a miſtake of his rectified, 56.

CYPRIAN, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 32. his account of the Chriſtian meetings, 67.

CYRIL, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 33. his Catalogue of Canonical books, 61. inſtructions

tions to his catechumen concerning the Scriptures, 67, n. his diſtinction of books Canonical, and ſuch as were doubted of, 69, n. Account of the Goſpel of Scythianus, 384, n. Cenſure of the Goſpel of Thomas, as the Goſpel of one of the Manichees of the ſame name, 397, n.

D

DAILLE, Monſ. demonſtrates the ſpuriouſneſs of a book under the name of Bartholomew, mentioned by the ſuppoſed Dionyſius the Areopagite, 171. a miſtake of his rectified by Bp. Pearſon, ibid, n. another concerning Bartholomew's Goſpel, 174. he thinks the Epiſtles of Ignatius to be ſpurious, 295.

DANIEL the Prophet, a citation out of him, whereby the Chaldee and Syriack languages ſeem to be ſynonymous, 95.

DE DIEU, his obſervation on the affinity of the Chaldee and Syriack languages, 95, n.

DIONYSIUS the Areopagite, one of St. Paul's converts at Rome, 170, n.

DOCETÆ, a branch of the Gnoſtick Hereticks, 332. ſuppoſed to forge Peter's Goſpel, which likely may be the ſame as the Goſpel of Baſilides, *ibid.*

DODWELL, Mr. a falſe opinion of his, concerning the books of the preſent Canon, eſpouſed by Mr. Toland, refuted, 42, n. 133. he thinks Peter's Goſpel was a forgery of the Docetæ, 332. his account of the age of Tatian, 390, n. a miſtake of his concerning the promiſcuous uſe of the Goſpels and Apocryphal books by the Fathers of the firſt century, 410, n. 414, 419.

DOXOLOGY at the end of the Lord's Prayer, various opinions of it, 115.

DRUSIUS, his proof of the Doxology, &c. 116. his opinion of the ſuppoſed loſt pieces of Paul, 136, 137, n.

DU PIN, Mr. the only perſon who has purpoſely written on the Canon of the New Teſtament, 17. defects in his performance, *ibid.* his miſtake about the word Euchariſt, 114, n. another concerning the time of the Syriack Verſion, *ibid.* his cenſure of the Egyptian Goſpel, 202, n. of the Goſpel of Eve; and a miſtake of his, 224, n. his ſentiments of the Nazarene, or Hebrew Goſpel, 285, n. his opinion of the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 390, n. a miſtake of his concerning Philip's Goſpel rectified, 383.

E

EBIONITES, what part of the New Teſtament they rejected, 8. the Apocryphal Acts of the Apoſtles made uſe of by them, 120. not extant, *ibid.* ſeems to have been a different name of the Hebrew Goſpel of Matthew, 126, 217. their Apocryphal Acts, 220. their Goſpel the ſame with the Nazarenes, &c. 221. They uſed the Acts of Peter, 326, n. eſteemed St. Paul their great enemy, 360. they and the Nazarenes always declared Hereticks by the Catholick Church, *ibid.*

EGYPTIANS, their Apocryphal Goſpel not extant, 120. teſtimonies of the antients and fragments of it, 197. ſentiments of modern writers concerning it, 201. five arguments proving it Apocryphal, 204. it was never cited, nor appealed to, by Clemens, 206. but utterly rejected by him, 207. compoſed by early Hereticks, and probably Egyptians, 209, 216. Their Therapentæ bore a great agreement with the Eſſenes, 213.

ELXAI, or ELXÆUS, a falſe prophet about the time of Trajan, A. C. 114. founder of the ſect of the Helkeſaites, &c. 225.

ENCRATITES, Apocryphal Goſpel of, not extant, 120. eſteemed the ſpurious Acts of Andrew

above

above all other Scriptures, and why, 151.

EPIPHANIUS, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 34. his Catalogue of Canonical books, 61. his cenſure of the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew, 149, n. of the Egyptian Goſpel, 200. He the only antient writer that mentions the Acts of the Apoſtles, received by the Ebionites, 217. and the Goſpel of Eve, 222, n. His cenſure of the Helkeſaites, 226, n. Account of the Goſpel of Judas Iſcariot, 234. of the Encratites, Apotacticks, and Origenians, 243. A miſtake of his concerning the Lucianiſts rectified, 252. he charges the Ebionites with forging books under St. Matthew's name, 253. mentions the Goſpel of Marcion, 263, n. his doubt whether Merinthus and Cerinthus were not one and the ſame perſon, 265. his account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Goſpel, 271, n. declares Paul's Revelation a forgery, 317, n. his opinion of the Anabaticon of Paul, 320. rejects the Acts of Peter as ſpurious, 326, n. his account of the Goſpel of Scythianus, 385, n. his account of the principles of Tatian, 388, n. cites the Acts of Thomas, 395, n. his hiſtory of Chriſt according to the fleſh, 445.

ERASMUS, queſtioned the authority of the Revelation, 9. ſays the hiſtory of the adulterous woman was wanting in moſt Greek copies, &c. 111, n. his acknowledgment of finding the doxology at the end of the Lord's prayer in all the Greek copies, 115, n. Sentiments of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, Thomas, Matthias, the Egyptians, Twelve Apoſtles, and Nicodemus, 201, n.

ESSENES, the great agreement between them and the Egyptian Chriſtians, 213.

EUCHARIST, in what ſenſe the word is uſed by Juſtin Martyr, 114, n.

EVE, Apocryphal Goſpel of, not extant, 120. has been obſerved by ſeveral modern, though only by Ephiphanius among the antient writers, 222, n. proved to be a forgery of the Gnoſticks, 224.

EUSEBIUS, his account of ſeveral books of the New Teſtament not received by ſome, who were not hereticks, in the firſt ages, 8. n. 270. Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 32. his Catalogue of Canonical books, 60. method of diſtinguiſhing between books, which are, or are not to be received, 64 to 70, n. he excludes the Shepherd of Hermas from the Canon, 70, n. cenſures the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew, 148, n. his account of a piece wrote by Agrippa Caſtor againſt Baſilides, 177. he declares the Acts of Peter, Thomas, &c. to be heretical forgeries, 241, n. ranks the Goſpel of Matthias among heretical books, 254. his account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Goſpel, 268, 270. he makes no uſe (as Mr Toland falſely ſuppoſes) of the Nazarene Goſpel, 299, n. rejects the Acts of Paul as ſpurious, 314. and the Acts of Peter as not Canonical, 325, n. as alſo his Goſpel 330, n. a fragment from him of *The Preaching of Peter*, 354. he rejects Peter's Revelation as not Canonical and ſpurious, 372, n. 376. is wrongfully charged by Toland and others, with ſelf-contradictions, 377, n. mentions the Goſpel of Thomas as heretical, 397, n.

EZRA ſettled the Canon of the Jews, 3.

F

FABRICIUS, Mr. obſerves that in ſome copies of Gelaſius's decree of Apocryphal books, there is no mention of Andrew's Goſpel, 154, n. he made a collection of Apocryphal books under our Saviour's name, 186. a miſtake of

of his concerning the traditions of Matthias rectified, 259, n. his nice diſtinction between the contents of thoſe traditions and a Goſpel, 260. he cenſures Mr. Toland, and condemns the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, 288, n. his miſtake in ſuppoſing the Anabaticon and Paul's Revelation to be different books, 319, n. produces a large fragment of Philip's Acts, 381, n. his obſervation on the Orthodoxographa, 390, n. miſtake concerning the Acts of Thomas, 395, n. another concerning the citations of the Fathers of the firſt century, 410, n.

FULLER, his obſervation on the affinity of the Chaldee and Syriac languages, 95, n.

G

GELASIUS, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 36. his cenſure of the Acts of Andrew, 150, n. famous decree concerning Apocryphal books, 154, n. thought to have been formed at Rome, A. C. 494. though ſome aſcribe it to Damaſus, and others to Hormiſdas; whence Baluzius conjectures it to have been begun by Damaſus, renewed by Gelaſius, and continued by Hormiſdas, 156. He cenſures the book of Leucius for Apocryphal, 244, n. and the Goſpel of Matthias for the ſame, 254. Mentions the Acts of Thecla and Paul, 313, n. condemns their Revelation as Apocryphal, 318, n. rejects the books under the name of Peter, called the books of Clemens, as Apocryphal, 326, n. as alſo the Goſpel under the ſame name, 331, n. mentions the Revelation of Stephen as ſuch, 386. does the like by the Acts of Thomas, his Goſpel, and Revelation, 395, n, 398, n. 399, n.

GNOSTICS, forge the Goſpel of Perfection, 380, n. a forgery of theirs mentioned by Irenæus, concerning Chriſt, 432.

GOSPELS, had not the preſent titles prefixed to them by their authors, 173, n.

GRABE, Dr. produces a ſuppoſed fragment of the Goſpel of Barnabas out of an old MS. in the Bodleian library, 161, n. but gives no reaſon in ſupport of his conjecture concerning it, 162. his error concerning the Revelation of St. John and Cerinthus, 183, n. Opinion of the Goſpel of the Egyptians, 202, n. his too fond opinion of Apocryphal books, 208. A miſtake of his in ſuppoſing the Goſpel of Matthias to be the ſame with the traditions, 255, n. 259. His collection of the fragments of Matthias's Goſpel, 215. of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes or Hebrews, 271, n. his ſentiments of the latter, 285, n. a miſtake of his concerning Hegeſippus, 296, n. another concerning Origen, 298. an abſurdity of his in ſuppoſing the Nazarene to be previous to St. Matthew's Goſpel, 307. His Acts of Paul and Thecla taken out of a MS. in the Bodleian library, 313, n. His diſtinction between the Acts of Paul and Thecla, and the Acts of Paul only, 314. an error of his rectified, *ibid.* another concerning the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 319. His account of a MS. now extant in Merton College, intitled, The Revelation of Paul, 324, n. His conjecture concerning the judgment of Peter, rectified, 338. too great opinion of the Preaching of Peter, 356, n. he would have Peter's Revelation equally orthodox with that of John, 372, n. wrongfully charges Euſebius with ſelf-contradiction, 376, n. his falſe concluſion from a paſſage out of Sozomen of the Revelation of Peter, 378, n. He ſuppoſes Peter's Revelation to be a prophecy concerning the ſtate of the Jews and the Chriſtian Church, *ibid.* n.

GREEK CATENA of the Twenty-three Fathers on John, has not the hiſtory of the adulterous woman, 111, n.

GREGORY, Mr. his account of a third Epiſtle of Paul to the Corinthians, 29. excellent obſervation of the genuineneſs of the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, 115, n. and from the Form of Prayer out of the tradition of the Elders, 116.

GREGORY NAZIANZEN, his catalogue of Canonical books, 61.

GROTIUS, his opinion of the time of the Syriack Verſion rectified, 114, n. aſſerts that St. Paul wrote ſeveral other Epiſtles, beſides thoſe we now have, 137, n. his conjecture concerning the Revelation of St. John and Cerinthus, 185, n. Sentiments of the Egyptian Goſpel, 201, n. of the Nazarene Goſpel, 284, n.

H

HARMONY of the four Goſpels compoſed by Tatian, 388. That of the Orthodoxographa not the ſame with Tatian's, 390, n.

HEBREW the firſt language of the world, 92. its various dialects, *ibid.*

HEBREW, Apocryphal Goſpel of, not extant, 120. was ſometimes called the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, and ſometimes of the Ebionites, 127. Vide NAZARENES.

HEGESIPPUS, cotemporary with Juſtin Martyr, 28. mentions the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, 30, 268. cites not the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, as Dr. Grabe and Mr. Toland wrongfully think, 296.

HEINSIUS, his opinion of the ſaying of Chriſt, mentioned by St. Paul, Acts xx. 35. p. 409.

HELKESAITES, what part of the New Teſtament they rejected, 8, 225. their Apocryphal books not extant, 120. ſeem to derive their name from Elxai, or Elxæus, who lived about the year 114, p. 225. They are eſteemed by Epiphanius as neither Jews, Chriſtians, nor Heathens, *ibid.* they were generally of the Jewiſh nation, 227.

HERACLEON, an heretick of the ſecond century; an account of him by Origen, 432. a more particular one of him and Theodotus, 344.

HERMAS, excluded by Euſebius from the Canonical books, 70, n.

HERMIANI. Vide SELEUCIANI.

HESYCHIUS, his falſe Goſpels not extant, 120. though mentioned by Jerome and Gelaſius as Apocryphal, and only interpolations of ours, 227.

HOOKER, Mr. a citation out of him, concerning aſſent to a propoſition, 116.

HUETIUS, his confutation of the Jews, in their charge againſt Chriſt for uſing magical arts, 192, n.

I

JAMES, Apocryphal piece of his not extant, 120. A book of his not the ſame (though thought ſo by Dr. Mill) with the Protevangelion, 230. Other books attributed to him, 231. thought by Dr. Mill to be wrote by Leucius, 232, n.

ICONOMACHI, the author's conjecture concerning them, 248, n.

JEROME, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 34. his catalogue of Canonical books, 62. Quotation of the Goſpel according to the Egyptians, 157, n. He places the Goſpel of Matthias among ſpurious books, 254. his account of the Nazarene Goſpel, 275. He miſtakes concerning Ignatius's uſing the Nazarene Goſpel, 293. affirms the Nazarene to be the ſame with the Goſpel of the Twelve Apoſtles, 299, n. reckons the Acts of Paul and Thecla Apocryphal, 312, n. the Acts of Peter, &c. the like, 325, n. the Goſpel of Peter the like, 330, n. the Judgment of Peter the like, 335, n. A fragment

ment of his, concerning the Preaching of Peter, 354. He rejects Peter's Acts, Gospels, and Revelation, Apocryphal, 372, n. censures the Gospels of the Egyptians, and of Thomas, 398, n.

JEWS, their haughty esteem of themselves, and contempt of all the world beside, 106. they charge our Saviour with using magical arts, 191.

IGNATIUS, his Epistle thought by some to be spurious, 295.

INNOCENT I. Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 36. his testimony of the forgeries of Leucius Charinus, 231, 240, 261. he rejects and condemns the books under the name of Matthias, or James the Less, 261, n. detects Leucius's forgeries under the name of Peter, 379, n.

JOHN, the Acts of, and other Apocryphal books under his name, not extant, 121, evidently appear to be the forgery of Leucius, 233.

IRENÆUS, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 30. his account of the Gospel of Judas Iscariot, 233. of the principles of Tatian, 390, n. mentions a forgery of the Gnosticks concerning our Saviour, 432. A grand mistake of his concerning the age of Christ, 436.

JUDAS ISCARIOT, an Apocryphal Gospel under his name not extant, 121. mentioned by Irenæus and Epiphanius, 233, n.

JUDE, an Apocryphal Gospel under his name not extant, 121.

JUSTIN MARTYR, his account of the weekly Christian meetings, 67, n. 97, n. he was a native of Palestine, in Syria, *ibid.* An objection concerning his residence at Rome, answered, 98. Another of Dr. Cave's, that he was unacquainted with the Syriack language, answered, 99. In what sense he used the word Eucharist, 114. does not cite the Gospel of the Nazarenes, 296.

K

KIRSTENIUS questioned the authority of the Revelation, 9.

L

LACTANTIUS, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 32. his fragment of The Preaching of Peter, 353. his account of an objection the Pagans used, that the verses of the Sibyls were a forgery of the Christians, 364, n.

LAODICEA, Bishops of, their catalogue of Canonical books, 61, n. they decree that no private Psalms, or book without the Canon, should be read in churches, 67.

LEONIDES, a corrupt writing instead of Leucius, 250.

LEONTIUS, LEUTHON, LENTITIUS, LUCIAN, } All these denote only one spurious book, the forgery of Leucius Charinus, 126.

LEUCIUS CHARINUS, his forgeries severely censured, 232, n. Leucius and Seleucus the same person, 239, n. Acts under his name the same as the Acts of Andrew and John, *ibid.* n. He was a Manichee, and lived in the latter end of the third, or beginning of the fourth century, 245. was a different person from Lucianus, *ibid.* the same with Seleucus, father of the Seleuciani, 246, n. His Acts spurious and Apocryphal, *ibid.* The judgment of Photius concerning them, 247. Leucius and Leonides one and the same person, 250. He forged books under Peter's and other Apostles' names, 379.

LIGHTFOOT, Dr. his proof of the Doxology, &c. 116, n. his conjecture concerning the text, 1 Cor. v. 9. rectified, 141. Another conjecture of his different from the former, 142.

LUCIANUS, a famous critick and martyr under Diocletian and Maximian,

Maximilan, 252. an interpolator of the Goſpels, *ibid.* a different perſon from Lucianus, *ibid.*

St. LUKE, his Goſpel formerly went under the name of St. Paul, 127, n.

LUTHER, his error in rejecting the Epiſtle of St. James, 8.

M

MAHOMET, in compiling his Alcoran, made great uſe of the Old and New Teſtaments, 460. does not cite either of our preſent Goſpels, or any book of the New Teſtament by name, and the reaſon of it, 461. was furniſhed with ſpurious and Apocryphal books of the New Teſtament, 462. could neither write nor read, *ibid.* His aſſiſtants in compiling the Alcoran, 463. He cites a hiſtory of the Virgin Mary and of Chriſt, 464. ſeveral paſſages in his Alcoran cited out of Apocryphal books, *ibid.* Reaſons why he did not mention thoſe books, 465.

MAHOMETANS charge the Chriſtians with having corrupted the Goſpel of Chriſt, 466. eſpouſed in it by the late Mr. Toland, 468, n. Four Sayings or Diſcourſes aſcribed to Chriſt by their doctors, 469.

MANGEY, Dr. his charge of diſingenuity and want of ſkill in Mr. Toland, 168. his conjecture concerning the original of the Goſpel of Barnabas, 170, n. his opinion of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, 288, n. confutes Mr. Toland's endeavour to prove the Nazarenes the only true Chriſtians, 361.

MANICHÆUS FAUSTUS rejected the New Teſtament, 8.

MANICHEES diſpute the authority of St. Matthew's Goſpel, 8. pretend to produce an Epiſtle of Chriſt's, 120. Acts of the Apoſtles uſed by them not extant, 121. a ſpurious book, and the forgery of Leucius Charinus, 126. They eſteemed the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew above other Scriptures, and why, 151. Their Acts the ſame with thoſe of Leucius Charinus, 262. their agreement with the Mahometans and Montaniſts, 393.

MARCION, what part of the New Teſtament he rejected, 8. his Goſpel not extant, 121. no other than a copy of St. Luke's altered and interpolated, 264. he took away the two firſt chapters, *ibid.* is cenſured by Serapion, 328.

St. MARK, his Goſpel no epitome of St. Matthew's, as Mr. Whiſton would have it, 85, n. was formerly aſcribed to Peter, 126, n.

MARRIAGE condemned by antient hereticks, 209, n.

MATTHEW, books under his name not extant, 121. are cenſured for Apocryphal, 231, 253.

MATTHIAS, a ſpurious book forged under his name by the Nicolaitans, 12. His Goſpel and traditions Apocryphal, 121, 254. Another book under his name not extant, 121. His Goſpel cenſured by Origen, Euſebius, Ambroſe, Jerome, and Gelaſius, as ſpurious and Apocryphal, 254. His traditions and fragments, 255, n. not written, but oral, 257. other books under his name rejected and condemned, 261, n.

MERINTHUS, his Goſpel not extant, 121. the ſame with the Goſpel of Cerinthus, 264.

MILL, Dr. affirms that St. Paul wrote ſeveral other Epiſtles than thoſe extant, 137, n. His account of the Goſpel of the Egyptians, 203. A miſtake of his concerning a book of James, and the Protevangelion, 230, n. Another concerning the age and perſon of Leucius rectified, 245. the cauſe of it; and an inſtance of his negligence in citations, *ibid.* A remark of the author on his Greek Teſtament, *ibid.* His miſtake in ſuppoſing Lucianus and Lucanus to be the ſame perſon, 252. another in ſuppoſing the Goſpel of Matthias to be the ſame

ſame with the traditions, 255. His opinion about the original and interpolations of the traditions of Matthias, and miſtake concerning Leucius, &c. 262. His ſentiment of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, 287, n. An error of his concerning the Acts of Paul rectified, 315, n. His conjecture concerning the different titles of the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 321, n. Opinion that the Judgment of Peter was the very ſame with the Revelation, refuted, 339. His ſentiments of The Preaching of Peter, 357, n. Account of the Apocryphal Goſpel of the Simonians, 386, n. Obſervation on the Orthodoxographa, 390, n. His miſtake concerning the Acts of Thomas, 395, n. he is cenſured for his various lections of the Goſpels, 406, n. falſely aſſerts the Fathers of the firſt century to have promiſcuouſly cited the Apocryphal Goſpels and inſpired books, 410, n. Miſtakes a citation of Clemens to the ſame purpoſe, 414, 419.

MILLENNIUM, the doctrine of, its riſe, 424.

MONTANUS and MONTANISTS, their riſe, 391. He is called by his followers the Paraclete, 393, n.

MONKS derive their original from Egypt, 214.

N

NAZARENES, Goſpel of, ſeveral errors in it noted, 10. not extant, 122. The author's conjecture concerning St. Paul's reference to it, 25. The difference between them and the Jews, 26. ſeems to have been a different name of the Hebrew Goſpel of St. Matthew, 126. the moſt famous of all the antient Goſpels, 266. referred to by St. Paul, 267. Fragments thereof, moſtly collected by Dr. Grabe, 271. The various ſentiments of later writers concerning this Goſpel, 283. why ſo highly eſteemed by many writers, 289. not cited by Papias, 291. no Verſion of it till Jerome, 292. not cited by Ignatius, 293. nor referred to, as of authority, by Juſtin Martyr, Hegeſippus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Euſebius, or Jerome, 296, n. This the ſame Goſpel as that of the Twelve Apoſtles, 298. proved Apocryphal in many inſtances, and for ſeveral reaſons, 300. compiled out of St. Matthew's Greek, 305. why called that of the Twelve Apoſtles, 306. allowed to be an early compoſure, 307. but full of fabulous ſtories, *ibid.* and made by convert Jews, 308. A brief account of the Nazarenes out of Irenæus, Euſebius, and Epiphanius, 309, n. This Goſpel and the Ebionites the ſame, 310. they were always ſtiled Hereticks by the Catholick Church, 360. notwithſtanding which, Mr. Toland endeavours to prove them the only true Chriſtians, 361, n.

NEXOCHARIS, or XENOCHARIS, a corrupt way of writing Charinus, the ſurname of Leucius, 250.

NICOLAITANS, their wicked deſign in forging a book under the name of Matthias, 12.

NONNUS makes no mention of the adulterous woman in St. John, 111, n.

NYE, Mr. his ſentiments of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, 286, n.

O

ORIGEN, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 31. his catalogue of Canonical books, 60. makes no mention of the adulterous woman in his Paraphraſe on St. John, 111. His reaſon for reading Apocryphal books, 129, n. he mentions the Goſpel of the Egyptians, 200, n. His opinion of the Helkeſaites, 225. was not the author of the Commentaries on Job, 253. ranks the Goſpel of Matthias among other ſpuri-

ous pieces, 254, n. His account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Gospel, 268. rejects it as Apocryphal, 298. mentions the Acts of Paul, 314, n. cites the Gospel of Peter, 329, n. His account of Heracleon, 344. His fragments of The Preaching of Peter, 351. He mentions the Gospel of Thomas as heretical, 397, n.

ORIGENIANS esteemed the spurious Acts of Andrew above the Scriptures, and why, 151.

ORTHODOXOGRAPHA. Vide HARMONY.

P

PAMELIUS, several antient writers cited by him concerning the Christian meetings, 67. His remark on the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 323, n.

PAPIAS, a citation from him, proving there were several spurious writings in his time under the name of the Apostles, 27. An instance of his too great fondness of traditions, 258. A character of him, 290, 420. His history of a woman accused before our Saviour of many crimes, 420. Two discourses ascribed by him to Christ, 422. He gave rise to the doctrine of the Millennium, *ibid.* which he seems to have borrowed from the Jews, 424.

PAREUS was of opinion, that St. Paul wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians, before either of those now extant, 137, n.

PARKER, Dr. confutes the Jews, in the charge they urge against our Saviour, for using magical arts, 192.

PAUL, several errors observed in the Gospel of his Preaching, 11. Paul and Thecla, their Acts, his Acts, his and Peter's Preaching, a book under his name, and his Revelation, not extant, 122. The last and the Anabaticon, one book, 126. A third Epistle of his, extant in an Armenian MS. to the Corinthians, 145. One from them to him, 144. plainly spurious, 146. The Acts of Paul and Thecla mentioned by Tertullian, Jerome, and Gelasius, as Apocryphal, 312, n. Thecla's Acts published by Dr. Grabe, from a MS. in the Bodleian Library, 313, n. The author, with Dr. Grabe, thinks that this book is extant, *ibid.* The Acts of Paul mentioned by Origen, Eusebius, and Philastrius, 314, n. not the same book with the Acts of Paul and Thecla, *ibid.* is Apocryphal, 316. The Preaching of him and of Peter one book, *ibid.* Another book forged by one Lucian, under the name of Paul the Martyr, *ibid.* n. Paul's Revelation cited by Epiphanius, Austin, and Gelasius, 317. The author supposes this and the Anabaticon to be one book, 318. proves that it is so, and Apocryphal, 322. This book seems to be referred to as such, in a passage of Tertullian, *ibid.* n. The Revelation of his now extant in Merton College, Oxon, a forgery, 324.

PEARSON, Bishop, attempts to prove that the Decree of Gelasius, concerning Apocryphal books, is spurious, 156, n. corrects an error in Monsieur Daillé concerning the time of the supposed Dionysius the Areopagite, 171, n.

PERFECTION, the Gospel of, not extant, 122. proved to be a spurious and Apocryphal book, the forgery of the Gnosticks, 380, n. A conjecture concerning the design of it, *ibid.*

PETER, his Acts, Doctrine, Gospel, Judgment, Preaching, Revelation, and books under his name, not extant, 122. His Gospel proved to be spurious by Eusebius, Athanasius, &c. 241, n. His and Paul's Preaching one book, 126, 316, 339. His Acts, or Travels, written by Clemens, one book, and censured for Apocryphal by the antients, 325. His doctrine, 327. Gospel cited by Serapion, Tertullian, Origen,

Origen, &c. *ibid.* Why Mark's Goſpel was formerly called his, 331. it was not compoſed by Leucius, but forged by the Docetæ, 332. and likely the ſame as the Goſpel of Baſilides, *ibid.* His book of Judgment accounted by Jerome Apocryphal, 335, n. by Ruffin not Canonical, but Eccleſiaſtical, *ibid.* n. His Preaching very antient, and cited by the Fathers, &c. 340. The Epiſtle of Peter to James ſeems to be the forgery of ſome Ebionite, *ibid.* produced at length in Greek and Engliſh, 341. Several fragments of his Preaching, 344. The concurrent opinions of late writers, to elevate the authority of it, 355. refuted, and the piece proved Apocryphal, 357. His Revelation cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, Theodoſius, &c. 370. rejected by Euſebius as ſpurious, 376. and by the antients, as Sozomen tells us, 378. ſuppoſed by Dr. Grabe and Dr. Mill to be a prophecy concerning the Jews and the ſtate of the church till Antichriſt, *ibid.* Other forgeries by Leucius under the name of Peter, 379.

PHILASTRIUS, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 340. his Catalogue of Canonical books, 61. Cenſure of the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew, 148. His charge againſt the Manichees, &c. for receiving the Apocryphal, and rejecting the Canonical books of the Apoſtles, 242. He pronounces the Acts of Paul Apocryphal, 314, n.

PHILIP, his Acts and Goſpel not extant in the writers of the firſt century, 381. pretended to be in the Vatican, *ibid.* n. His Goſpel a forgery of the Gnoſticks, and a fragment of it produced by Epiphanius, 382, n. its abominable doctrines, 383, n. proved to be Apocryphal, *ibid.*

PHOTIUS, patriarch of Conſtantinople, his juſt obſervation on the forgeries of Leucius, 232, n. 240. a further account of them by him, 247. His account of the Hypotypoſes under Clemens's name, 373.

PLACÆUS, an abſurdity of his concerning books Canonical and Apocryphal, 56.

PRIDEAUX, Dean, obſerves it was the cuſtom of Mahomet, to flatter the Chriſtians on all occaſions, 466.

PTOLEMAIS, its antient names among the Iſraelites, 103.

R

REVELATION, book of, why omitted in the publick calendar for reading the Scriptures, 59.

RICHARDSON, Mr. his ſentiments concerning the Nazarene Goſpel, 287, n.

RUFFIN, Apocryphal book mentioned by him, 36. his Catalogue of Canonical books, 62. his account of the Judgment of Peter, 335, n.

S

SATANAS, its derivation, 101.

SCYTHIANUS, the Goſpel of, not extant, 123. mentioned by Cyril and Epiphanius, 384. He was founder of the Manichean ſect, *ibid.*

SELEUCUS, his Acts of the Apoſtles not extant, 123. He is the ſame with Leucius, 239, n. 246, 386.

SELEUCIANI (called alſo Hermiani) their tenets, &c. 246.

SERAPION, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 30. His account of the Goſpel of Peter, 327, n.

SERGIUS, a Neſtorian, the principal aſſiſtant of Mahomet, in his Alcoran, 463.

SEVERUS, what part of the New Teſtament he rejected, 8.

SIBYLS, an account of them, and their forged prophecies, 362.

SIMON, Father, his defence of the antiquity of the Syriack Verſion, 117, n. his ſentiments of the Goſpel of the Egyptians, 202, n.

n. He condemns the Goſpel of Eve for Apocryphal, 224, n. His high opinion of the Nazarene, or Hebrew Goſpel, 284, n. wrongfully charges Euſebius with ſelf-contradiction, 377.

SIMONIANS, ſo called from Simon Magus, their Goſpel, 386.

SIXTUS SENENSIS, his ſentiments concerning the Goſpel of the Egyptians, 201, n. his miſtake concerning the traditions of Matthias, 259, n. Opinion concerning the Nazarene or Hebrew Goſpel, 284, n. his favourable opinion of The Preaching of Peter, 355.

SOZOMEN, his fabulous account of the Revelation of Paul, 321, ſays, Peter's Revelation was read yearly in ſome Churches of Paleſtine, 378, n. but was rejected by the antients, as ſpurious, *ibid.*

SPANHEIM, Mr. an obſervation of his concerning Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, 5. an error of his concerning the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 319, n.

STEPHEN, the Revelation of, not extant, 123. declared Apocryphal by Gelaſius, 386.

STYLES of authors various, with a diſſertation upon them, 77.

SYRIACK Verſion, 85. an hiſtorical account of it, 86. when firſt known among the Europeans, 87. The judgments of learned men about it, 88. An attempt to prove this Verſion was made in the Apoſtles' times, 89. This language is ſometimes called Chaldee, ſometimes Syriack, ſometimes Syro-Chaldaick; but moſt commonly by the writers of the New Teſtament, and firſt Chriſtians, Hebrew, 91. It was the language of Syria and Meſopotamia, and of Jeruſalem and Galilee in our Saviour's time, 92. Syriack and Chaldee are by the prophet Daniel ſynonymous languages, 95. This Verſion has not the hiſtory of the adulterous woman mentioned in St. John, 111, n. nor the famous controverted text, 1 John v. 7. *ibid.* nor has the old Verſion the four catholick Epiſtles, nor the Revelation, 112. This Verſion was thought by Tremellius and Bp. Walton to be made in the Apoſtles' time, *ibid.* n. The antiquity of it confirms the purity of the printed copies of the New Teſtament, 117. is of great uſe in explaining many paſſages, 118. The controverted text, 1 Cor. v. 9. paraphraſed by the old Syriack tranſlator, 141.

SYRIANS were the firſt idolaters mentioned in Scripture, 108, n. among the Jews, that appellation denoted prophane perſons, *ibid.*

T

TATIAN, the Goſpel of, not extant, 123. mentioned by Euſebius and Epiphanius, 387, n. was a Harmony of the four Goſpels, 388. ſeems to be taken from the Hebrew Goſpel, 389. An account of him and his principles, *ibid.*

TEREBINTHUS, afterwards called Manes (the father of the Manichees) ſtiled himſelf the Paraclete, 393.

TERTULLIAN, Apocryphal books mentioned by him, 31. his account of the Chriſtian meetings, 67, n. Interpretation of 1 Tim. iv. 3. p. 209. Account of Marcion's Goſpel, 263, n. He cites the Acts of Paul and Thecla, 312, n. ſays the Goſpel of Mark is affirmed by ſome, to be that of Peter, 329, n.

THADDÆUS, the Goſpel of, not extant, 123. declared Apocryphal by Gelaſius, 390, n.

THECLA, martyrdom of, how, and by whom firſt publiſhed, 31. Vide PAUL.

THEMISON, his Catholick Epiſtle not extant, 123. mentioned by Apollonius, 391. he was a Montaniſt, *ibid.*

THEODOTUS BYZANTIUS, Apocryphal

pocryphal books mentioned by him, 31. his fragment of The Preaching of Peter, 351. a particular account of him and his Hereſies, 358. He cites the Revelation of Peter, 371, n.

THEOPHYLACT, makes no mention of the adulterous woman in John viii. p. 111, n.

THERAPEUTÆ, an account of them from Mr. Whiſton, 203.

THOMAS, the Acts, &c. under his name not extant, 123. mentioned by Epiphanius, Athanaſius, and Gelaſius, 395, n. not the ſame with thoſe of Leucius Charinus, 396. A MS. of it ſaid by Father Simon to be in the French King's library, and another by Dr. Grabe, in our Bodleian, *ibid.* His Goſpel mentioned by Origen, Euſebius, Cyril, Ambroſe, Athanaſius, Jerome and Gelaſius, 397, n. there were two Goſpels under his name, 399. His Revelation only mentioned, and declared Apocryphal by Gelaſius, *ibid.* Other books under his name condemned by Innocent I. *ibid.*

TOBIT, Book of, guilty of a direct falſity, 10.

TOLAND, Mr. his pretended Catalogue of Canonical books not complete, 4. his falſe opinion, concerning the depoſitory of the books of the preſent Canon till Adrian's time, 43, n. He endeavours to confirm a conjecture of Dr. Grabe, concerning a fragment of Barnabas's Goſpel, 162. His account of an Italian MS. he had ſeen of it, *ibid.* A notorious falſe inference of his detected by Dr. Mangey, 167, n. A malicious miſtake of his, concerning the books reported to be written by our Saviour, 186. An inſtance of his inaccuracy in quotations, 194, n. His diſingenuity in citing, as genuine, a forgery of the Ebionites, 219, n. Folly in placing among Canonical books the Goſpel of Eve, 224, n. as alſo that of Judas Iſcariot, 234, n. A miſtake of his in eſteeming the Traditions of Matthias as a written book, 259, n. his ſentiments of the Hebrew or Nazarene Goſpel, 286. his extravagant poſitiveneſs, and unpardonable miſtakes, 234, n. Another concerning Hegeſippus, 296, n. Another very notorious in relation to Origen, 298, n. his unpardonable falſehood in aſſerting, that the Fathers appealed to the Nazarene, as a true Goſpel, 300. The Author's juſt rebuke, and admonition to him, *ibid.* An inſtance of a notorious impoſture of his, 301, n. his falſe citations of St. Auſtin and Epiphanius detected, 313, n. An ignorant blunder of his concerning the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 319, n. His endeavour to prove that the Nazarenes were the only true Chriſtians, 361. anſwered by Dr. Mangey, *ibid.* his fond opinion of The Preaching of Peter, 357, n. He eſteems Peter's Revelation as valuable as ſeveral books of the preſent Canon, *ibid.* n. He injuriouſly charges Euſebius with a miſtake, 377. refers to a citation out of Sozomen, to prove Peter's Revelation not ſpurious, 378, n. ſuppoſes that Revelation to be a prophecy concerning the Jews, and the ſtate of the Chriſtian Church, *ibid.* n. His ignorance and malice in his diſtinction, between *Paraclete* and *Periclyte*, detected, 393. He ſupports the charge of the Mahometans againſt the Chriſtians, of having corrupted the Goſpel of Chriſt, 468.

TRADITION, certainly the beſt method to prove the truth of the ſacred books, 54. An objection to it anſwered, 57.

TREMELLIUS thought the Syriack Verſion to be made in the Apoſtles' times, 112, n.

TRUTH, the Goſpel of, not extant, 123. condemned by Irenæus, 400, n. a forgery of the Valentinians, 401.

U

VALENTINUS, Goſpel of, not extant, 123. different from the Goſpel of Truth, 404.

VALESIUS, wrongfully charges Euſebius with ſelf-contradiction, 377, n. his opinion of the Harmony of the Orthodoxographa, 390.

VOSSIUS, a miſtake of his concerning the language ſpoken in Jeruſalem, in our Saviour's time, rectified, 94.

USHER, Bp. proves Ignatius's Epiſtle to be corrupted and interpolated, 295, n. His ſentiments of a Saying of Chriſt in the Epiſtle of Barnabas, 410.

W

WALTON, Bp. thought the Syriack tranſlation of the New Teſtament to be made in the Apoſtles' time, 112.

WISDOM of SOLOMON, book of, a groſs error in it, 10.

WHISTON, Mr. a citation from him, concerning the Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles, 6. his error concerning St. Mark's Goſpel, 85, n. his ſentiments of the Goſpel of the Egyptians, and account of the Therapeutæ mentioned by Philo, 203, n. He wrongfully ſuppoſes the Egyptian Goſpel, and Traditions of Matthias, to be uſed among them, *ibid.* n. would have The Preaching of Peter Canonical, 357, n. recommends Peter's Revelation as a ſacred book, 373. His miſtake concerning a Saying of Chriſt, cited by moſt of the Fathers, 442.

WHITBY, Dr. his examen of Dr. Mill's various Lections, &c. 116, n. 406. his interpretation of 1 Cor. v. 9. rectified, 141. his remark on 1 Tim. iv. 3. p. 213, n. Opinion of the Hebrew or Nazarene Goſpel, 288, n. His miſtake concerning the woman of Samaria, 421.

WILKINS, Mr. an overſight of his, in the dedication of his tranſlation of the third Epiſtle of Paul to the Corinthians, and Paul's Epiſtle to them, 146.

X

XENOCHARIS, a corrupt way of writing Charinus, 250.

END OF VOL. I.

ERRATA IN VOL. I.

P. 19. l. 10. for *afrerwards* read *afterwards*
31. l. 8. for *Hypotopoſ.* read *Hypotypoſ.*
89. l. 1. for *Chriſtians* read *Chriſtians*
92. l. 1. for *Chriſtrian* read *Chriſtian*
94. l. 7. for *Nonnius* read *Nonnus*
142. l. 7. dele *having*
161. l. 7. for ἀπογυιῶν read ἀντηγυιῶν
168. l. 25. } for *relicts* read *relicks*
169. l. 29. }
199. l. 1. for ἔργα, δὲ read ἔργα δὲ,
203. l. 2. for *cited of* read *cited out of*
226. l. 14. for προφητίαν read προφητείαν
248. l. 18. for γένεσιν read γένεσιν
255. l. 25. for παραχρῆσθαι read παραχρῆσθαι
299. l. 9. for *call* read *calls*
349. l. 24. for τὸ read τὸν
418. l. 16. for *hew as* read *he was*
442. l. 7. for *and* read *and*

00066957

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 15 June, 2016